

SOCIALISM FOR STUDENTS



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A A 001 450 570 6

JOSEPH E. COHEN



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

D. J. P. Gleeson,
314-i2.

Socialism for Students

By

JOS. E. COHEN



80

CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1912

Copyright 1909
By Charles H. Kerr & Company

H X 86
C 665

PREFACE

This little work consists of a series of articles reprinted from the columns of "The International Socialist Review," and written in answer to the request of its editor for a study course in Socialism.

The aim of the author is to indicate in briefest outline some of the more salient points in the Socialist philosophy, so as to give the reader an inkling into the nature of the modern Socialist movement. At best this treatise can serve only as a framework. The much more important task of rearing the structure remains for the student. It is hoped that the course of reading, suggested in the appendix, will be found of service in this respect.

So far as possible the author has followed the beaten path of Socialist thought and purposely tried to avoid phases of the question over which there is serious dispute. Where anything new is offered, of course he alone is responsible.

J. E. C.

Philadelphia, June 24, 1909.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	3
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER II. THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT..	18
CHAPTER III. SOCIALIST ECONOMICS.....	31
CHAPTER IV. THE CLASS STRUGGLE.....	47
CHAPTER V. HISTORICAL MATERIALISM....	62
CHAPTER VI. SOCIALISM AND SCIENCE.....	78
CHAPTER VII. SOCIALIST SOCIOLOGY.....	94
CHAPTER VIII. SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY.....	114
CHAPTER IX. SOCIALIST STATEMANSHIP....	130
APPENDIX	149

SOCIALISM FOR STUDENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Socialism is the issue to-day. It is the inspiration of press, pulpit and forum, the theme of artist and poet, the problem of problems confronting the statesman. For many years the Socialists of Germany, France and other European countries have been able to say that their governments formulated no policy without first considering how it would affect the Socialist movement. In America the new force was a little slow in coming to be felt. But the spectre of Socialism has entered the White House and is being wrestled with by the two dominant political parties.

While Socialism is the all-absorbing topic of discussion, it is a subject concerning which the greatest misunderstanding prevails. Thus, within recent years Eugene Richter, while member of the German Reichstag, wrote a book called "Pictures of the Future," in which he most effectively demolished the straw man who advocates governmental interference in every detail of life. And in the campaign of 1906 our own Speaker of the House of Representatives, Joseph G. Cannon, unburdened himself of the "stalest of the stale"—that "Social-

ism means dividing up." We are still told that Socialism would reduce us to a dead level, or that human nature is too imperfect to permit of the realization of the new order; that Socialism means paternalism—extension of governmental regulation, or anarchy—destruction of all government; that Socialism existed thousands of years ago, or that it is a thousand years ahead of the times; that Socialism is a beautiful but impossible utopia, or that it is the coming slavery.

We need not pause here to meet these common objections to Socialism. They have been admirably answered by Work, Spargo, Vail, Hyndman, Plechanoff and Marx and Engels. The objections usually encountered are found to spring either from misinformation as to what Socialism is, or, more particularly, the aim of the Socialist movement. In studying Socialism, we can, in a great measure, note the historical situations that gave rise to other schools of thought and that prompt the criticisms offered by the opponents of Socialism.

If Socialism is not what the non-Socialists declare it to be—what is it?

Here is the word of an authority:

"Modern Socialism," says Engels, in his "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," "is in its essence, the direct product of the recognition, on the one hand, of the class antagonism existing in the society of to-day, between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wage-workers; on the other hand of the anarchy existing in production."

Let us dwell upon this definition. It contains several points, indispensable for a clear understanding of the question.

First of all, we are dealing with modern Socialism—not the early socialism of Owen, St. Simon, Fourier and the like. We are not dealing with the many attempts that, from Plato to Bellamy, have been made to design a beautiful utopia upon the impression that, irrespective of actual conditions, it needs but to be presented to any people in order to be promptly accepted. We are not dealing with the prehistoric communism of tribal society, nor with the communism practiced in the early days of Christianity.

The Socialism of our time flows out of circumstances "existing in the society of to-day," not that of five hundred years ago or ten thousand years ago. Here we at once part company with many non-Socialist political economists. Unlike them, we shall not trespass upon Robinson Crusoe's mythical island. The Indian with his bow and arrow shall, for the time being, be allowed to rest his oft-troubled bones in peace in his happy hunting ground; the Esquimaux and South Sea Islanders, too, shall be permitted to go their own way rejoicing. For, in this connection, we shall deal only with countries in a state of civilization.

The circumstances which concern us here are the heritage especially of the industrial revolution of the last century. Certain discoveries and inventions gave us steam and

electricity for power, which, applied to the simple, inexpensive tool, through the transmitting mechanism of fly-wheels, shafting, pulleys, etc., transformed it into a complicated, expensive machine. With the industrial revolution, society began to separate, roughly speaking, into two classes; those who own the machines and those who operate them. In other words, a small number of the people, capitalists, possess as their exclusive private property the land, mines, factories, railroads and other important instruments by the use of which goods are produced to satisfy human wants; while the great mass of the people, workers, possess only their brain and brawn, which they dispose of to the capitalists for wages.

- Employers and employes meet upon the labor market, the capitalists as buyers, the workers as sellers, of labor power. The capitalists aim to buy the labor power of the workers as cheaply as possible; the workers aim to sell their labor power as dearly as possible. Out of this inherent conflict of interests between them arises the class struggle.

The industrial revolution, at the same time, brought about the factory system with its division of labor and the world market. In the factory thousands of men and women and children toil together, each performing but a single task, the results of hundreds of operations being finally assembled into the finished article. More than that, the four corners of

the earth vie with each other in contributing food and clothing for employer and employe, and the building material, illumination, fuel, raw material, machinery and power, for the factory. Again, the factory product is not retained by those who have toiled together to bring it forth, but by the factory owner. But rarely does the owner use even a morsel of the goods produced in his factory. He produces, not for his own use, but for sale. Almost invariably he thrusts the article upon the market in competition with the wares of other lands. Commerce thus breaks down all barriers, destroys all geographical boundaries, establishes international relations and makes the working class of the whole world kin. Merchandise is your most persistent globe trotter.

But while the production of goods is a social affair, it is nevertheless carried on by the capitalist class for their private profit; that is to say, production is social, while ownership and distribution are individual. The workers make, and the capitalists take. It is this contradiction between socialized production and capitalist appropriation which causes the waste, lack of order and anarchy that prevails in the making and disposing of goods.

Thus we have the anarchy in production and the consequent class struggle. To explain fully the capitalist system of production, showing that the more useless the capitalists become the richer do they wax in the unpaid

labor of the workers, showing that the system is responsible for the economic ills from which we suffer, showing that the trend of industrial progress is toward the collective, social ownership by the whole people of the means of production they use in common—that is Socialist political economy. To organize, upon the basis of the class struggle, those who are dissatisfied with present arrangements, voicing the aims of the oppressed, fighting their battles and having for its ultimate object the elimination of the anarchy in production and the ending of the class struggle—that is the Socialist movement.

To aid him in clearly understanding present society, the Socialist turns to the discoveries in the modern sciences, embraces the theory that evolution lies in a change from the simple to the complex, and that every organism and organization rises, flourishes and carries within itself the seeds of growth to a higher order. The Socialist brings to light the hidden secrets of past society as his contribution toward the solution of the "riddle of the universe." And the result of this excursion is the materialistic interpretation of history, the theory that, from epoch to epoch, changes in the forms of government, human nature, arts, sciences, philosophies and conceptions of the purpose of existence can be accounted for only by considering the changes in the manner of securing a livelihood; that, consequently, since prehistoric communism, one struggle between oppressors and op-

pressed has followed another, these struggles being always political in character, and that the time has now come when the industrial revolution must be supplemented by a political and social revolution, whereby the workers, in securing power, once and for all abolish class distinctions. Modern Socialism is therefore scientific. The Socialist movement is therefore a political movement.

Relying upon the assurance that every transformation in the economic basis of society is attended by a transformation in the intellectual superstructure, Socialism maintains that once the economic question is settled, that once the lust of gain at the expense of our fellow men is no longer the paramount incentive, as it is to-day—breaking up the family into a camp of enemies—that once the economic pressure is removed, there will follow such a blossoming of what is best in human nature as will be a veritable rebirth of the soul of man.

The Socialist ideal, therefore, rests upon a solid foundation.

The Socialist traces the development of the family, property and the state, from ancient down to modern times. By knowledge of the changes the form of the family has undergone in the past, he can more intelligently consider the problems of morality and ethics. In like manner, knowledge of the history of property and government enables him to explain ideas of justice and equity, duties and

rights. Especially is this of service in setting aside the evils that can be treated immediately from those that will only adjust themselves after the fundamental wrong is righted. The sociology of the Socialist, therefore, assumes the broadest dimensions.

The Socialist then directs his attention to the manner in which the human brain operates. He inquires into the process of thinking and ascertains the method by which the mind forms ideas and spins philosophies. He discovers that the material is the substance of the ideal; but, that they complement each other in a universal conception. By so doing the Socialist exposes the false reasoning and undermines the last stronghold, the dualism, of his opponents; he establishes a monistic view of life growing out of historical materialism, and completes the synthetic philosophy of Socialism.

In thus dividing Socialism into a system of political economy, a theory of social evolution and an ideal, and showing its relation to modern science, sociology and philosophy, we are just as arbitrary as is Shakespeare in dividing the span of man's life into seven ages. For Socialism is not a piece of mechanism, which can be decomposed into its parts, requiring only lubrication and the touch of some man's finger to start it a-going. To the thirty millions of men and women of all climes and complexions who constitute the international Socialist movement, Socialism is a compact

whole, one and indivisible, striving for the freedom of the human race from economic bondage.

Because capitalism degrades woman even more than man, and because the emancipation of society at large depends upon the emancipation of woman, woman takes her place by the side of man in the Socialist movement; because society is divided into two contending classes, the Socialist movement is a class movement; because economic questions are political questions, the Socialist movement is a political movement; because the working class are without a country, migrating from one end of the earth to the other in search of masters, because capitalism is international, the Socialist movement is international; because the source of the trouble is the contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation, not reform but social revolution is the remedy; because the workers cannot free themselves without at the same time freeing all mankind, the Socialist movement has the grandest ideal known to history.

Socialism is something more than the passing of one order in favor of another. It is born of the slavery, the anguish and the travail of the world's toilers. The story of labor's struggle upward out of bondage is written in tears and blood. It is a record of bold spirits who have been ostracized and exiled because of their convictions. It is a record of noble men who have gladly abandoned lives of ease and luxury to bend their genius to the cause of the oppressed. It is a record of a mighty host who

have gone to their graves "unwept, unhonored and unsung," because of the unquenchable fire of justice burning in their bosoms. It is a record of the sublimest comradeship that ever encircled the earth.

With the rise of the Socialist movement, labor ceases to be an object of pity and charity. Conscious of its wrongs and how to right them, it no longer looks to the upper class for its salvation, but sounds the call for the solidarity of the workers of the world. Against the political economy, the science, the philosophy, the law, the ethics, the art and the ideals of the masters, it submits its own political economy, science, philosophy, law, ethics, art and ideal. Against the present labor offers the future.

Finally, the Socialist recognizes that, while the revolutions of the past have been fought and won by the lower classes without either they or the upper classes having a well-defined idea of the outcome, the benefits have, on that account, accrued largely to the upper classes; that the social revolution which it is the mission of the working class, as a class, to accomplish, because it is a movement for the benefit of the masses, requires the intelligence of the workers and particularly a thorough familiarity with Socialist thought by those who ally themselves with the cause of the workers. The slogan of the Socialist is, therefore: "More light, more light!" His emblem is the arm and torch.

Through the labyrinths of darkness and gloom the seeker after truth must wend his

way for the golden thread of knowledge. It is thus that the torchlight is ever borne aloft by her apostles, now to flicker and wane among the crags, then to illuminate the sombre wilderness; now to be lost in the caverns, then to burst forth anew from the mountain peaks: ever forward, ever onward, ever upward!

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT

The present order in which we live did not begin the moment the first human being had the breath of life blown into his nostrils. It came much later. In fact it is less than six hundred years old, having developed out of a former social order, known as feudalism, which was based upon the ownership of land by lords and barons.

Nor was the present order ushered in with the hearty approval of those most concerned. Quite the contrary. The manner of its coming is fairly indicative of its whole career.

Let us turn to the last part of volume I of "Capital", dealing with "The So-called Primitive Accumulation," for light upon this point. Here we learn that in the transition period between feudalism and capitalism, bands of feudal retainers were broken up, arable land was transformed into sheep walks, the church was despoiled of its property, crown lands were stolen, the commons were enclosed, estates were "cleared" of the peasants, several Irish villages thus being depopulated at one blow, while in Scotland areas as large as German principalities were swept clean. In a "clearing" made for the Duchess of Sutherland, 15,000 inhabitants were rooted out, their

villages destroyed and burnt and their fields turned into pasturage. By this means the Duchess appropriated some 794,000 acres of land that had from time immemorial belonged to the clan.

Marx also tells of the "bloody legislation" by which feudal serfs were bludgeoned into becoming factory workers. Anyone idling about for three days was branded with a red hot iron with a V on his breast, refusal to work forfeited a man's economic freedom; did he absent himself a fortnight from his master, he was branded with an S, upon his back, after which, did he run away thrice, he was executed as a felon.

"The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalised the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation. On their heels tread the commercial wars of the European nations, with the globe for a theatre."

True enough is it, as Marx says: "In actual history it is notorious that conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, briefly force, play the great part." In short, "Capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt."

And when the industrial revolution had been accomplished, when feudalism had been supplanted by capitalism, what was the result? Great blotches upon the earth's surface called cities eclipsed the hills, the meadows, the lanes, the running brooks and the glorious sunsets of rural life.—great cities in which the inhabitants are huddled together in a mad struggle for existence. Engels has described England as he found it half a century after the introduction of machinery: "In London, fifty thousand human beings get up every morning, not knowing where they will lay their heads at night.... The poverty is so great in Dublin, that a single benevolent institution, the Mendicity Association, gives relief to 2,500 persons or one per cent of the population daily, receiving and feeding them for the day and dismissing them at night." Similar conditions are cited for Glasgow, Edinburgh and other cities. Engels enumerates the diseases peculiar to the workers and gives figures to show that the death rate among the poor is twice that among the rich. And after telling of the terrible conditions under which factory "hands" are compelled to work, he concludes: "Women made unfit for child bearing, children deformed, men enfeebled, limbs crushed, whole generations wrecked, afflicted with disease and infirmity, purely to fill the purses of the bourgeoisie."

Of the hardships inflicted upon the children John A. Hobson says: "There is no page in the

history of our nation so infamous as that which tells the details of the unbridled greed of these pioneers of modern commercialism, feeding on the misery and degradation of English children."

The same charges—with even a greater burden of proof—can be made against the England of to-day. For example, turn to Jack London's "People of the Abyss," narrating experiences which befell him in the largest city in the world in the summer of 1902, during a period of "good times."

"One million, eight hundred thousand people in London live on the poverty line and below it, and another 1,000,000 live with one week's wages between them and pauperism," he declares. "The population of London is one-seventh of the total population of the United Kingdom and in London, year in and year out, an adult in every four dies on public charity, either in the workhouse, the hospital or the asylum." "There are 300,000 people in London, divided into families, that live in one-room tenements. Far, far more live in two and three rooms and are as badly crowded, regardless of sex, as those that live in one room.... There are 900,000 people living in less than the 400 cubic feet of space prescribed by the law." And of those who have employment, according to Sir A. Forwood: "One of every 1400 workmen is killed annually, one of every 2,500 workmen is totally disabled; one of every 300 workmen is temporarily disabled three or four weeks."

But these are only figures. And figures are cold and lifeless—they do not touch the human heart. Let us take a few incidents, which are just as true of American cities. "The shadow of Christ's church falls across Spitalfields Garden, and in the shadow of Christ's Church, at three o'clock in the afternoon, I saw a sight I never wish to see again.... 'Those women there,' said our guide (pointing to a group of the 35,000 wretches of the slums, not depraved women, who are homeless), 'will sell themselves for thru' pence, or tu' pence, or a loaf of stale bread.'" Also, this experience, which London tells of his two companions, a carter and a carpenter: "From the slimy sidewalk, they were picking up bits of orange peel, apple skin, and grape stems, and they were eating them. The pits of green gage plums they cracked between their teeth for the kernels inside. They picked up stray crumbs of bread the size of peas, apple cores so black and dirty one would not take them to be apple cores, and these things these two men took in their mouths, and chewed them, and swallowed them."

The author sums it up thus: "In short, the London Abyss is a vast shambles. Year by year, and decade after decade, rural England pours in a flood of vigorous strong life, that not only does not renew itself, but perishes by the third generation." And, quoting the scientist Huxley: "Were the alternative presented to me I would deliberately prefer the

life of the savage to that of those people of Christian London."

So much for the "classic land of capitalism." What song does America sing? America, the new world, the Canaan of natural resources, with its vast expanse of fertile soil, magnificent forests, navigable rivers, and unlimited opportunities? Here, as in the old world, the "primitive accumulation" began with immense land grants, bestowed upon court favorites by kings at the expense of the original inhabitants, with no other warrant than that "possession is nine points of the law." Stealing of lands is quite a gentlemanly occupation. Some of the colonial surveyors—patriots, all—were not averse to doing it, and, in our own time, several eminent gentlemen have been exposed as timber land thieves. And speaking of patriotism, we may here note that just that time when love of country runs strongest is seized by unscrupulous men of means to defraud the people, in filling army contracts and taking advantage of the financial embarrassment of the government. That this has been so all down our history, Laurens, in the Revolution, Lincoln, in the Civil War, and General Miles, in the war with Spain, bear witness.

Another method in vogue generally and in line with primitive accumulation is the despoiling of inventive genius. Not only do the benefits of progress inure largely to the few, but it is considered axiomatic that inventors must fill paupers' graves. Edison is such a shining ex-

ception to this rule, that he is regarded as the marvel of the age.

Well, capitalism is established in America. We know it by its fruits. For when Robert Hunter stated the problem of poverty, he rendered so many counts in the indictment against the present social system. "These fragments of information, indicative of a widespread poverty," he says, "fall under the following heads: Pauperism, the general distress, the number of evictions, the pauper burials; the overcrowding and insanitation due to improper housing; the death rate from tuberculosis; the unemployment, and the number of accidents in certain trades."

The many fragments of information gleaned by Hunter are summarized by him as follows: "There are probably in fairly prosperous years no less than 10,000,000 persons in poverty; that is to say, underfed, underclothed and poorly housed. Of these about 4,000,000 are public paupers. Over 2,000,000 workingmen are unemployed from four to six months in the year. About 500,000 male immigrants arrive yearly and seek work in the very districts where unemployment is the greatest. Nearly half of the families in the country are propertyless. Over 1,700,000 little children are forced to become wage-earners when they should still be in school. About 5,000,000 women find it necessary to work and about 2,000,000 are employed in factories, mills, etc. Probably no less than 1,000,000 workers are injured or killed each year while doing their work, and about

10,000,000 of the persons now living, will, if the present ratio is kept up, die of the preventable disease, tuberculosis."

Between eighty and ninety-four per cent of the houses in the large cities are rented; in the year 1903, 60,463 of such "homes" in Manhattan, fourteen per cent of the total, were broken up by forcible eviction. In the city of New York, too, one out of every ten persons who dies is buried at public expense in Potter's Field.

Isador Ladoff also furnishes us with some interesting data. Over one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars is spent annually in the State of New York alone for charity. Dr. Savage is quoted as saying that one-fourth of the tenement population take advantage of the free treatment of the dispensaries. A specific instance of conditions in the large cities surrounding modern industrial enterprise is described by A. M. Simons in his "*Packingtown*," the antecedent of "*The Jungle*."

Under the influence of the chapter on "The Child" in "*Poverty*," John Spargo made a more thorough investigation into the hardships of child life, the results of which he gives us in his work, "*The Bitter Cry of the Children*." We can here only hint at the wealth of information that work contains. "In Chicago, the death rate varies from about twelve per thousand in the wards where the well-to-do reside to thirty-seven per thousand in the tenement wards." "I think it can safely be said that in this country, the richest and greatest country

in the world's history, poverty is responsible for at least 80,000 lives every year." In connection with which this should be considered: "The experts say that the baby of the tenement is born physically equal to the baby of the mansion."

"Sanitary conditions do not make any real difference at all; it is food and food alone," declares Dr. Vincent. Personal examinations conducted by Spargo showed that as many as 20 per cent of school children are underfed.

The employment of children who belong in school, child-slavery, is the blackest crime in our social arrangement. The frightful condition depicted by Engels wherein children from orphan asylums and other institutions were hired by mill owners never to return alive, has been equaled by a similar condition in the glass factories of New Jersey, within our own time. In the coal regions of Pennsylvania and other states, thousands of breaker boys sit all day long before the shutes down which rushes tons of coal and slate. Their fingers are bruised and distorted by the work. They are not only deprived of schooling, but even of the opportunity of exchanging a thought with their mates unless they shout at the top of their lungs, so great is the din. And while children of tender years are employed throughout New England and all industrial states, it is only when we cross the Mason and Dixon Line to the sunny South that the institution of child slavery is presented to us in all its horror.

We cite a few instances taken from the

United States Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor for May, 1904. At that time, whatever improvements may since have been made, South Carolina prohibited the labor of tots only under ten years of age, but had no provision for factory inspection. Georgia had no age limit, and Alabama none to speak of. North Carolina prohibited the employment of children under 12 years of age but had no provision for carrying this into effect, so that children 6 and 7 years of age were found working. Violations were plentiful in every state. Except for a very few in two establishments, the children in the Southern States were white children. The working hours were as many as sixty-six a week. None of the children reported for North and South Carolina and Alabama had foreign-born parents, while in some instances no less than thirty-seven per cent were unable to read and write English. And the number of child slaves is constantly increasing!

But this is only part of the price the working class pay for the privilege of dragging their weary bodies from the cradle to the grave. For the profit of the capitalist class, so we are informed by Dr. Wiley, after twenty-five years' work in the Department of Agriculture, practically everything we eat and drink is adulterated.

For the profit of the capitalist class there are "he" towns and "she" towns, with the result that hundreds of thousands of men and women pass their lives in enforced celibacy. And worse than that, the inability of young men to

earn enough to support families, is responsible for the fact that half a million women peddle their virtue as merchandise upon the street. And so great is the marital incompatibility, due in no small measure to economic reasons, that it is reported there were a million divorces in the United States within the last three years.

From year to year, as the rich grow richer and the poor poorer, the contrast between the two classes is intensified. At one pole, the upper class is steeped in degeneracy. At the other pole, there sinks an element, creatures of the city "dumps" and "slums", into the under world. Both scum and dregs are lost to the race.

Periodically the entire system is thrown out of joint by industrial crises, due to the exploitation of labor, the anarchy in production, and the fact that the capitalist class cannot control the Frankenstein, the productive forces, they have conjured into being. During a commercial depression, the industrial reserve army of out of works is increased by millions of recruits, with a consequent demoralization of the whole working class. At such a time, the feeling of insecurity as to the present and uncertainty as to what may come, that ever haunts the workers, grows into a veritable nightmare. It is just this fear of the morrow that stings more than poverty itself and that is the strongest charge in the indictment of capitalism.

Thousands of babies are every year the victims of preventable diseases, caused in the

main by malnutrition; women are unfitted for the function of motherhood, due to their toiling in the factories, while to name the dangerous occupations in which men are employed is to give an inventory of occupations—almost every trade having its special disease. In some cases it is the monotony of work that wrecks the nervous system; in others, the strain upon certain parts of the body or certain organs; in others, the unsanitary conditions of the workshop; in others, the handling of dyes and poisons, or the inhaling of foul air and dust. It is the last named particularly that is responsible for tuberculosis.

Tuberculosis is not only a social disease—it is a poverty disease, a working class plague—well named the Great White Plague. One glance at the map at a tuberculosis exhibit suffices to show where the “lung” districts are—suffices to prove that out of the working class comes the hundreds of thousands of men and women and children in America who fall in the white massacre. Every occupation has its distinct disease; tuberculosis is the distinct disease of capitalism.

This, then, is the Socialist indictment: That after thousands of years of toil and trial, after having stolen the secrets of the skies and harnessed the forces of nature, society is still engaged in a fiendish struggle for animal existence, a struggle that dooms the great mass of the people to poverty and misery, degradation and disease, slavery and untimely death. And the Socialist charges that the great under-

lying wrong out of which these evils arise is the fact that the few own what the many need. And the Socialist declares that only when society holds as common property the means of wealth production will the social ills that we are heir to be banished, for only then will the toil of the people inure to the common weal and make for the common good.

CHAPTER III

SOCIALIST ECONOMICS

Political economy concerns itself with the bread and butter question. To study this question in all its aspects, to understand the material conditions of life, which Hegel termed "civic society," is the purpose of political economy. For, as Marx said: "The anatomy of that civic society is to be found in political economy."

Just now we are going to examine the anatomy of present day society—capitalist society. How can we distinguish capitalism from feudalism and chattel slavery? What is capital? "Capital," say the non-Socialist economists, "is that part of wealth used to create more wealth." This definition is about as satisfactory as the old Greek's description of man—"a featherless biped." It is true that man is a featherless biped, but there are other featherless bipeds—and all featherless bipeds are not men. Man is something more than a featherless two-legged animal. And, in the same way, capital is something more than "that part of wealth used to create more wealth."

We know that capitalists are not feudal lords and that capitalists are not slave owners. No one but a non-Socialist economist would

think of saying there were capitalists in the dark ages any more so than he would think of speaking of the astronomy of Adam's day. A definition of capital, to be worth anything, must lay stress upon its historical character as well as its peculiar function; it can be true only of certain countries at certain times under certain conditions. Capital is a transitory arrangement and the laws of capitalist production apply only to capitalism. They do not apply to the finding of diamonds on the street, or to handicraft, or to the fine arts. The laws of capitalist production do not apply to all production carried on to-day, and do not apply to other systems of production, such as chattel slavery and feudalism.

Here is the definition of John A. Hobson: "Capitalism may provisionally be defined as the organization of business upon a large scale by an employer or company of employers possessing an accumulated stock of wealth wherewith to acquire raw materials and tools, and hire labor, so as to produce an increased quantity of wealth which shall constitute profit."

Capitalism, therefore, requires: Production on a large scale; the workers divorced from the ownership both of the means of production and the product of their labor; the capitalist class owning the means of production, hiring the workers for wages and retaining the product of the workers' labor; production for sale and the profit of the capitalist class.

With that we are ready for Marx's illu-

minating sentence, which is a keynote to the critical analysis of capitalism: "The wealth of those societies, in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as an immense accumulation of commodities, its unit being a single commodity."

A commodity is something bought and sold. It is an article that satisfies some human want or fancy. It is a product of labor. But while every commodity is a product of labor, every product of labor is not a commodity.

Every product of labor that serves a useful purpose has use value. Yet a thing may be very useful to the man who makes it, such as the raft of the backwoodsman, and not be a commodity.

To be a commodity, a product of labor must bring a price upon the market. It must be a common object of trade and produced with the end in view of being exchanged for money—of being sold. In addition to having use value, to be a commodity it must possess exchange value.

Use value may be a personal affair; exchange value is a social relation.

It is the possession of exchange value that turns a labor product into a commodity. Under all systems of production are articles produced for their use value. It is the particular production of exchange values, or commodities, that distinguishes capitalism from feudalism, chattel slavery and primitive communism. In capitalist society exchange value is so much

more important than use value, that whenever we speak of value we mean exchange value.

Let us now see how value is determined.

"Labor produces all wealth," say some political economists. This is another "featherless biped" definition. For we must know what sort of labor produces use value and what sort of labor produces exchange value. And on this point a dignified silence is too often maintained.

To produce use value, such as hats, it requires labor of a certain kind, the labor of hatters, not that of cigarmakers. This labor of a certain kind, the labor of hatters in shaping hats or the labor of cigarmakers in rolling cigars, is called concrete labor. Concrete labor produces use value.

Now, when we say, "This hat is worth four dollars, while this box of cigars is worth only two dollars," it is because hats and cigars have something in common, other than that they contain concrete labor. We take it for granted that the hat was made by hatters, not cigar makers, and that the cigars were not made by hatters. Exchange value is not created by concrete labor. The problem here is not "what kind," but "how much?" Exchange values are quantities, not qualities.

Exchange value is determined by the amount of labor in the commodity. It is not the particular labor of hatters and cigar makers that you buy with dollars, so much as a certain amount of general labor. You pay four dollars for a hat and two dollars for a box of cigars, because, as a rule, twice as much average labor

has been spent in making the hat as was spent in making the box of cigars, just as you pay twice as much for two boxes of cigars as you pay for one. This labor that you buy with money, because it is considered apart from the nature of the labor performed, is called abstract labor. This, then, is the difference between the two:

Concrete labor produces use value. Abstract labor measures exchange value.

Further: All labor is not of one grade. But the more skilled can be reduced to the less skilled; one day's high class labor is worth, say, two day's simple labor. This is not a very difficult thing to do since, as Marx tells us, "Unskilled labor constitutes the bulk of all labor performed in capitalist society, as may be seen from all statistics." Nor do we deal with the actual labor of the individual. Production is for the market and the competition of other producers is involved. Value is a social relation. A more exact definition, therefore, would be: Exchange value is measured by the average amount of simple, abstract labor, socially necessary to produce the commodity.

Commodities produced, they are next exchanged. Money is the medium of exchange, accepted in all countries reached by capitalism; money is the universal equivalent. While the money paid for some commodities, their price, is above their value, and the price of others is below their value, value is at the bottom of price and, taking the whole field of capitalist

production into consideration, commodities may be said to exchange at about their value. The tendency is for exchange to be between equal values.

But if only labor creates value, and if commodities exchange at about their value, how does it come that Mr. Coldeash, who owns a factory, who does no labor, but is taking the rest ~~cure~~ at Monte Carlo, receives a very satisfactory yearly income?

Here another character steps upon the scene.

This character is the worker. He comes to the market where only commodities are bought and sold. He owns no commodities. He has no hats, cigars, or diamonds to sell—at least not in any considerable quantity, and capitalism concerns itself only with production on a large scale. He cannot sell commodities, yet this is a commodity age. What can he sell?

He has something to sell which every capitalist is anxious to buy. The worker sells his labor power, the use of his brain and brawn, for wages. Wage-labor is an institution peculiar to capitalism, as against serfdom and chattel slavery. And the worker throws his labor power upon the market as a commodity.

Mr. Coldeash is in business purely for business. Now, the price of the commodity labor power, like all commodities, rests upon its value. And the principal factor in determining its value is the amount of abstract labor it requires to keep glowing the spark of life in the workers and enable them to reproduce the

species; that is to say, the amount of food, clothing and shelter required to sustain life.

We say "principal factor," not the only factor. Socialists do not hold to the "iron law of wages." For, to quote Marx, "There are some peculiar features which distinguish the value of the laboring power, or the value of labor, from the value of other commodities. The value of laboring power is formed by two elements—the one merely physical, the other historical or social. Its ultimate limit is determined by the physical element, that is to say, to maintain and reproduce itself, to perpetuate its physical existence, the working class must receive the necessaries absolutely indispensable for living and multiplying.... Besides this mere physical element, the value of labor is in every country determined by a traditional standard of life. It is not merely physical life, but it is the satisfaction of certain wants springing from the social conditions in which people are placed and reared up."

For the rest, that the cost of production is the principal element in determining wages is illustrated by the fact that scales of wages vary from town to town according to the different standards of living.

Labor power is sold as a commodity. What happens? Mr. Coldcash starts in business by paying so much for raw material, machinery, heat, light, etc., and so much for labor power. Let us say he invests \$1,000,000, of which

\$200,000 goes for wages during the year. At the end of that time there are profits to the amount of \$100,000. By what magic did Mr. Coldeash's \$1,000,000 breed \$100,000 while Mr. Coldeash was taking the rest cure at Monte Carlo?

Once again, what entered into the production?

First of all, raw material, machinery, fuel, light, power, etc., worth \$800,000 and, let us say, all used up. Turn these commodities about as you will, equal values exchange for equal values, whether before or after production. The \$800,000 worth of goods are worth just that amount in the finished products.

There was also \$100,000 worth of labor power. Let us follow that a little more closely.

When a worker sells his labor power, he sells it for about what it costs him to produce it. A day's pay is about what it costs the worker to live a day. But the amount of time he works that day has next to nothing to do with his cost of living. That is regulated by the competition of workers for employment, the strength of unions, factory legislation, etc. And, mark it well, regardless of whatever influences may favor him, there is a considerable difference between the number of hours it takes him to produce value equal to his wages and the total number of hours constituting the working day, for which he has to work for those wages. There is a substantial difference between the value the worker creates and the wage he receives for creating it. When the

capitalist buys labor power for a day, he pays for the number of hours it takes the worker to produce the equivalent of his wages; he pays for, say, three hours. When the capitalist sells the worker's product he sells the total number of hours the worker has toiled; he sells, say, nine hours. This difference of six hours' labor time and value the capitalist pockets. This is surplus value.

Thus while Mr. Coldeash's manager buys and sells labor power at its value, he nevertheless realizes \$100,000 worth of surplus value. "Surplus value is unpaid labor," is the theory that Marx was the first to critically examine and elucidate. And unpaid labor is the cornerstone of the present social order.

Let us follow Mr. Coldeash. That worthy gentleman does not pocket all of the \$400,000. He has rented the factory from Mr. Codfish, a member of the landed aristocracy. Mr. Codfish must maintain himself in a manner becoming his station, which means that he must not soil his lily white hands or wrinkle his brow with work. To avoid doing so, he exacts rent, say \$10,000 a year. Moreover, Mr. Coldeash is under some obligations to Mr. Moneybags, the financier, who lent Mr. Coldeash the \$1,000,000 with which he started in business. Mr. Moneybags is also one of the pillars of society and must be supported in idleness. So Mr. Moneybags very graciously receives back his principal with interest at the current rate, say \$60,000. What Mr. Coldeash retains as his share, \$300,000, is industrial profit. While this

division does not always take place, one individual often officiating in two or even the three capacities, yet if for no other reason than to explain their different stages historically, we divide surplus value into rent, interest and profit.

The distinction between profit and surplus value should be emphasized. Profits are calculated on the total investment. Surplus value represents the exploitation of labor and is based upon the wages only. In the case here given, the entire profits were about \$100,000 on the \$1,000,000 invested, or 10 per cent. At the same time that \$100,000 was extracted out of the labor of the workers whose wages were \$200,000. The rate of surplus value was 200 per cent.

The difference between profit and surplus value is so marked that one may increase while the other decreases. For example, take the "law of diminishing returns," offered by Mr. Coldeash's apologists to excuse his pocketing the unearned increment. It happens that normally, in a number of commercial enterprises, by the increase of invested capital laid out in more expensive machinery, etc., as well as artificially, by over-capitalization, watering of stocks, lobbying and bribery of public officials, keeping a double set of books, and such other methods best known to the eminent ly respectable Mr. Coldeash, the average rate of profit may be shown to be dwindling from year to year. The rate of exploitation, how ever, constantly increases, due to labor-dis

placing machinery, the growth of the industrial reserve army and the consequent intenser struggle for work, so that labor, and not capital, brings in diminishing returns. This, and this alone, accounts for the tremendous increase in the national wealth and the making of multi-millionaires.

We may, in passing, also consider a few more of the explanations offered to show cause why Mr. Coldcash and his colleagues are entitled to retain their unearned increment. Here is one holy trinity that is frequently encountered: Mr. Coldcash's profits are merely his wages of risk, superintendence and abstinence. Wages or risk—by which it is claimed that the worker should insure Mr. Coldcash against the risk of not realizing surplus value. Wages of superintendence—which overlooks the fact that surplus values were never so scarce as when Mr. Coldcash superintended the business and never so abundant as when Mr. Coldcash was taking the rest cure at Monte Carlo. Wages of abstinence—which ignores the fact that Mr. Coldcash was only abstinent when the surplus value was meagre: now that it is plentiful he is no longer ascetic, but leads a life of debauchery—or, rather, takes the rest cure—at Monte Carlo.

But if the capitalist class are to be remunerated for lack of risk, superintendence and abstinence, why not the workers who do run all risk of life and limb, do the superintending, and whose wages compel them to

be abstinent? Why is it that, for the workers, "virtue is its only reward?" The fact that dividends come to owners whether they be children, insane or degenerate, shows that surplus value is secured without returning an equivalent.

In view of the ground we have now covered, let us amplify our definitions. Here is what Marx says of capital: "Capital does not consist of means of subsistence, implements of labor, and raw materials alone, nor only of material products; it consists just as much of exchange values. All the products of which it consists are commodities. Thus capital is not merely the sum of material products; it is a sum of commodities, of exchange values, of social quantities." Hyndman and Untermann, besides Marx, have developed this thought further, illustrating the many garbs in which capital appears, also the divers functions money performs.

As to value and price, Untermann quotes Kautsky upon an important point. "It is not the value, but the price of production, which forms under a developed capitalist mode of production the level, around which market prices fluctuate under the influence of demand and supply. The price of production, however, is not floating on air, but rests upon value." The price of production consists of the cost plus the average rate of profits which the capitalists are able to secure at the particular time. In regard to value, price of production and market price, it is well to heed what Marx

says: "By comparing the standard wages or values of labor in different countries, and by comparing them in different historical epochs of the same country, you will find that the value of labor itself is not fixed but a variable magnitude, even supposing the values of all other commodities to remain constant. A similar comparison would prove that not only the market rates of profit change, but its average rates."

Whatever the ups and downs of the market, such as supply and demand, "buying cheap and selling dear," the influence of monopoly and such other "higgling of the market," which affect prices and give one capitalist the advantage over another, however turbulent the sea of conflicting emotions upon which capitalists are tossed as to the desirability of securing a slow, small and sure return on their investments as against a quick, large, but uncertain return, the workers remain the sole producers of value and the capitalists remain the idlers and appropriators of surplus value. When commodities have been produced, exchanged and distributed under the methods generally prevailing (all of which is included in the term production), the only exploitation of the workers peculiar to capitalism has been accomplished.

With Marx's theory of surplus value as an X-ray, to borrow an idea from one of Rata Langa's masterly cartoons, we can lay bare the mechanism of capitalist production. It is the exploitation of labor, the accumulation of

surplus values in the shape of exchange values in such quantity as to glut the market, that is the primary cause of commercial crises. A commercial crisis apprehends Messrs. Gold-cash, Calfish and Moneybags in the act of "getting away with the goods." Here we may insert, both D. A. Wells and Hyndman note that the crisis of 1873 was the first to indicate that peoples even remotely connected with capitalism are bound up with it in sharing the shock of an industrial disturbance. Capitalism scourges the whole world.

During a crisis, the enterprise of smaller capitalists is assimilated by the industrial giant. This also results from attacks upon the "malefactors of wealth," and from insurance scandal and "frenzied finance" exposures. For the timid, petty traders are always first to sell when the market takes a bad turn and thus play into the hands of the big holders.

Aside from any "illegal" measure, which is but the hissing steam signifying that the water, the current of commerce, has reached the boiling point—the point wherein consolidation is inevitable—the tendency for capital to concentrate in every industry and to centralize into the hands of fewer capitalists, is only a higher form of the present system of production. Investment continues until an industry is saturated with capital, then independent companies are merged into one, the corporation next absorbs the business closely allied with it, the tentacles of the more successful

promoters and captains of industry spread out in every direction until there comes "the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world market and, with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime."

Vandervelde and John A. Hobson describe the trust tendency. Hobson shows that in the manufacture of American agricultural implements, just as in other manufactures, the number of establishments has declined appreciably from 1880 to 1900. Altogether, in that time, the dependent class has increased 73.6 per cent, while the employing or independent class has increased only 27.4 per cent. Curiously, data to show how rapidly the number of manufacturing establishments is decreasing crept into the Republican Campaign Text Book for 1908. At the same time, it is true, as Hobson says further along, "We find that it is precisely in those trades which are most highly organized, provided with the most advanced machinery, and composed of the largest units of capital, that the fiercest and most unscrupulous competition has shown itself." Such death grapples for mastery end in still greater consolidation and serve notice that the time is ripe for making the means of production the collective property of the people.

In the hands of the Socialist, political economy ceases to be the "dismal science." The Marxian school, the historical school, vitalized political economy. More than that, the Socialist is not concerned with economic measures that oppress the capitalists of one

country for the benefit of those of another country. He knows that exploitation has no fatherland. The Socialist is not a nationalist, but an internationalist. In his hands political economy becomes a social science.

Only by the aid of the Marxian theories can we fully understand capitalist production, account for the poverty of the workers and the riches of the idlers, explain the widening gulf between the two classes, the periodic industrial depressions and the rise of monopoly.

To the Socialist, capitalism when fully developed is at the point where it is in a condition of ~~socialized~~ production ready for ~~socialized~~ ownership, whereby the means of production will be stripped of their ~~present~~ class character as capital, so that labor power will no longer be a commodity and exploitation of the producer will cease. Then the workers will receive the value they create, distress in the midst of plenty will be impossible, the world's productive forces will be scientifically and planfully controlled, and the problem of political economy will be solved: To so arrange the material conditions of life as to result in the happiness of the whole people.

CHAPTER IV

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles," say Marx and Engels, in the "Communist Manifesto." These are the first words written on modern Socialism. The recognition of the fact that the condition of the workers cannot be improved by an appeal to the innate goodness of mankind at large, but can come only through the conscious action of the workers, as a class—that is what distinguishes the Socialist movement from all other movements. Reduced to a sentence, Socialism is the workers' side of the class struggle. Unless it acknowledges its class character, Socialism is like the play of Hamlet without "the melancholy Dane," like a ship at sea without a chart.

Marx and Engels were not the first to note that a conflict rages between economic classes amounting to war. Plato said as much. Here in America, Madison wrote in "The Federalist," at the very beginning of the nation's career: "The most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society." And John

C. Calhoun declared almost a score years before the "Manifesto" appeared: "I hold then that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labor of the other.... It is useless to disguise the fact. There is and always has been, in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital."

It is the special merit of Marx and Engels to have first observed that the class struggles of history are a "series of evolution," characterizing the change from one social arrangement to another, and constituting a law of social development.

In America, more so than elsewhere, the impression prevails that because our form of government is republican, there are on that account no classes in society. Yet that very word "society" proves the reverse. When the papers tell us that Miss Coldeash is about to make her debut, they do not mean that she is about to be born. They serve notice on a certain exclusive set who are "society," that Miss Coldeash is open for matrimonial engagements. Daughters of the lower class never make their debut. When an industrial depression sets in, said to be caused by "overproduction," no one imagines that the surplus is in the hands of the workers—that the poor are in distress because they possess too much. Nor does anyone imagine that old-age pensions are for retired millionaires.

Classes are and always have been in Ameri-

ca, because classes have been all down recorded history. The class struggle was the first fruit of private property. But the simple fact of the class struggle is often obscured by the glamor of romance, which is the principal stock-in-trade of many historians. Austin Lewis is entirely right when he says of the American Revolution: "It was carried through with the most pompous announcements of human liberty which hardly veiled the real designs of its instigators. It denied its professed theories at its very inception by the proclamation of human rights and the acceptance of chattel slavery." Not only the black race, but thousands of whites, were held in bondage for years, while political liberty was restricted to such an extent that less than one-fourth of the adult males had a vote in the first election.

It is true, however, that while there always have been classes in America, class lines have not been so sharply defined as they are just now. John Adams is reported to have said that he hoped the time would never come when a man would be worth a million dollars. To-day a million dollars is of little consequence in the commercial world. We are reaching the billionaire stage. About half a century after Adams, Oliver Wendell Holmes thanked his stars that "it was but three generations between shirt sleeves and shirt sleeves." The third generation of our time run little risk of returning to the plow or forge. However prodigal they may be, they can hardly squander their income, let alone impair their capital,

which indeed, is often held in trust for them. After Holmes, Lincoln, in his first message to Congress, wrote: "A few men own capital, and that few avoid labor themselves, and with their capital hire or buy another few to labor for them. A large majority belong to neither class—neither work for others nor have others work for them." Today labor for wages is the ordinary manner of gaining a livelihood; capital is supreme—it is a jealous god and will have no other gods before it.

Again, John Adams said: "America is a nation of husbandmen, planted on a vast continent of wild, uncultivated land; and there is, and will be for centuries, no way in which these people can get a living and advance their interests so much as by agriculture. They can apply themselves to manufactures only to fill up interstices of time, in which they cannot labor on their lands, and to commerce only to carry the produce of their lands, the raw materials of manufactures, to the European market." Yet the American Revolution was fought to free the manufacturers and indebted Southern planters no less than the farmers, fishermen and merchants of New England, whom Adams served. Moreover, Adams was the second and last president to look after the interests of the sea coast, being defeated largely by the combination of the interests he considered of secondary importance. And however little Adams represented the Northern agricultural element, which his words refer to, with his defeat that element never again con-

trolled the national government. Still the farmer of the Revolution, who "fired the shot heard round the world," has given us a line of sturdy sons of the soil, who have fired many a good shot since; in our own time through the Grange movement, the Greenback and Peoples parties and, in conjunction with the workers of the shop, through the Socialist party. So it has come about that, as Ghent puts it: "America may have been another name for opportunity, as Emerson said, but it is evident that to hundreds of thousands of persons opportunity itself was but a name."

The class structure of society to-day has been most clearly defined in the tables made by the thorough and painstaking Lucien Sanial. He divides the total number of employed persons, ten years of age and upwards, into three classes. The plutocratic class numbers 250,251, is 0.9 per cent of the total, possesses \$67,000,000,000 or 70.5 per cent of the total wealth; the middle class numbers 8,429,845, is 29 per cent of the total, possesses \$24,000,000,-000 or 25.3 per cent of the total wealth; the proletarian class numbers 20,393,137, is 70.1 per cent of the total, possesses \$4,000,000,000 or 4.2 per cent of the total wealth. Sanial himself points out that the wealth of the working class consists largely of tools and household goods. It averages about \$200 a person—hardly enough to drive Standard Oil out of business. The middle class, while serving as a cushion between the two classes, nevertheless comprises divergent interests so incapable of

concerted action as to be of much less importance than their strength of numbers and wealth would lead one to suppose. They are ground between the upper and nether millstones. For all practical purposes, there are two classes in society. Such a conservative trades union leader as John Mitchell admits that the workers can no longer hope to rise out of their class. The matter of fact of it is, a handful of money kings sway the nation's course.

It is not meant to imply that these class lines are rigid and absolute. The contention is that, whatever shifting of individuals there may be from one class to another, however indefinite the lines of demarcation may be, there still remain the capitalist class and the working class, distinct from each other, with antagonistic and irreconcilable interests. Even were this shifting of individuals increasing instead of decreasing, so long as the means of life are permitted to be privately owned, there must of necessity be a capitalist class and a working class, exploiters and exploited.

Nor does the theory of the class struggle imply that all is smooth sailing for the class rising to power. A revolution is often followed by a reaction or a counter-revolution; a class secures power only to find itself unable to handle it and is compelled to share it with the class it has superseded. Thus Untermann describes the present dominant class: "The history of bourgeois revolutions is a succession of compromises... Indecision and compromise

are bred in the bourgeois blood. It was the fate of the bourgeoisie to be born between two fires. In the attempt to extinguish the one and keep from being extinguished by the other, the bourgeois nature developed that weather vane mind for which it has become historically disreputable." Thus the American government was established through concessions of the commercial and manufacturing classes to the slave owners of the South, who belonged to an obsolete social order. Thus, also, prior to the Civil War, Hinton Rowan Helper, in his "Impending Crisis," argued that the non-slave holding whites of the South were being ruined by "King Cotton," and called upon them to stamp out the "peculiar institution." On the other hand, the Southern oligarchy always looked down with disdain upon the business shrewd Yankee.

Further, while capitalism tends to urge industrial and financial capital to the top, it by no means eliminates other forms of capital. The frequent occurrence of "rent riots" in the larger cities indicates that landlords have not forgotten how to turn the screws upon the workers. But to learn how all-powerful industrial and financial capital is today, we need but follow the acts of government. Thus, the treaty of peace recently made between Japan and Russia is attributed to the banking houses of Rothschild and Morgan. Study a nation's policies and you can readily tell what class is in the saddle. Political power is the handmaid of economic power.

The capitalist class ever availed themselves of governmental force to keep the workers down. As Marx records, in addition to compelling agricultural laborers to become factory hands, the English government was successfully invoked to extend the length of the working day, establish a maximum scale of wages, with fines for those who accepted anything above it, and to outlaw trades unions. Later some of these measures became unnecessary, because of the growth of the industrial reserve army, while others were battered down by the workers themselves taking a hand in politics.

For their part, the workers are, as Shelley's verse runs, "heroes of unwritten story." "The unwritten history of this country is the history of the American working people," says Untermann. During ancient and mediæval times, except for occasional outbursts in the shape of revolts, which were more or less quickly suppressed, the workers occupy the background in the social drama, apparently content to shed their blood for their masters. The foreground is pre-empted by the ruling classes, quarreling over pelf and place. Feudal lords succeed slave owners; capitalists wrest the sceptre from feudal lords; each in turn exploits and oppresses the wealth producers. Every time a ruling class goes down, it opens the way for the next struggle. Yet the field ever narrows until only the workers and capitalists remain. The grapple between these two marks the close of the series, for when the workers free

themselves they free humanity from all class distinctions.

At the same time, the workers were plunged into capitalism amid the clashing of tremendous forces, the roar of the cannon no less than that of the steam engine. The spirit of the toilers has been militant down the decades. Strikes began in colonial days, although the labor movement dates from about 1830, the year the first steam engine was introduced in America. Says Simons: "It is to these early working class rebels that we owe to a larger degree than to any other cause not only our public school system, but abolition of imprisonment for debt, the mechanic's lien law, freedom of association, universal suffrage, improvement in prison administration, direct election of presidential electors and in fact nearly everything of a democratic character in our present social and political institutions. . . . For the working class directly they succeeded in shortening hours and improving conditions in many directions. They even brought sufficient pressure to bear upon the national government to compel the enactment of a ten hour law and the abolition of the old legislation against trades unions, which had made labor organizations conspiracies." This was accomplished about the same time similar reforms were won in England.

It was not until about twenty years later that the organized labor movement began in earnest. With the discovery of gold in California, in 1848, the point farthest west was

reached. The frontier was annexed to the Atlantic Coast when trans-continental railways swung out through Chicago ten years later. When the West became neighbor to the East, there was an exchange of ideas; the West benefited by Eastern culture, while the East profited by the Western spirit. That, together with the fall of the slave oligarchy, cleared the road of all obstacles in the way of modern capitalism, and since then its development has been phenomenal. But lurking behind rampant capitalism, its very shadow, has been the modern labor movement.

Within the period covered by a decade either side of the Civil War, most of the international trades unions now in existence were organized. Keeping step with the expanse of capital, industrial conflicts assumed greater proportions, involving an ever larger number of workers, until, in 1877, for the first time something like a general strike prevailed. This grew out of a reduction in wages among railroad men, one of the burdens labor bore because of the crisis of 1873. The workers of the country again joined hands for the inauguration of the eight hour day on May 1, 1886. In 1894 a sympathetic strike of the American Railway Union tied up the nation's arteries of traffic. Again, in 1902, America was shaken from coast to coast when the coal miners went on strike.

In the trouble of 1877, Rutherford B. Hayes, then president, ordered the federal troops to the scene to cow the strikers into submission. In 1886 a more expedient method was found

by hanging some leaders of the movement, upon the flimsy and unsupported charge of their being responsible for the Haymarket bomb explosion. The strike of 1894 was broken by the usurpation of both judicial and executive branches of the government. "Government by injunction" was resorted to and found effective after President Cleveland failed to break the strike with federal troops, sent to Chicago over the protest of the mayor of the city and the governor of the state. The strike of 1902 was more diplomatically broken by President Roosevelt's coming, like the Greeks, bearing gifts—gifts of honeyed words for the miners and flattery for their leaders.

It is well nigh impossible to compile a list of the many instances in which city and state executives have wielded the strong arm of the government to end strikes. The most nefarious methods ever used, probably, are those of the mine owner's association and its sister corporations, in the war on the metalliferous miners. In the Coeur d'Alenes, in the late '90's, and in Colorado, culminating in the stormy days of 1904, the master class excelled themselves. The workers were deprived of their constitutional rights, herded by the militia wholesale into filthy enclosures known as bull pens unprotected from the elements, and subjected to every conceivable indignity. Their women folk were outraged by the Hessians, their stores and property destroyed and they themselves often bayoneted out of town or deported by train and warned never to

return on penalty of death. In this gentle manner have the profit-thirsty capitalists taken pains to demonstrate that "there are no classes in America!"

Possibly the most outrageous violation of law and liberty came when Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, prominent in the Western Federation of Miners, were kidnaped from their homes at night, and confined in prison for over a year and a half before being brought to trial. The noteworthy feature of this case was the abject servility to capital with which the partners in the conspiracy against the miners, from Washington to Boise, performed their parts, and the fact that the Supreme Court, in so many words, handed down the Dred Scott decision of wage-slavery: The workers have no rights their masters are bound to respect.

While strikes seem to be clumsy weapons in the arsenal of the workers, in consideration of the money spent, the sacrifices endured and the frequency of failure, their importance should not be underestimated. They have that priceless educational value that comes only from experience. They implant in the toilers the feeling of solidarity and concern for a common cause; in tying up an industry, they show by a stroke that labor alone is indispensable for the welfare of society. In breaking the continuity of their humdrum existence, opportunity is offered to the workers to clear their lungs of factory grime, to loaf their souls in the sunshine, to learn that there is a life outside of

that of the noise of machinery, to listen to the song of brooks and books, to be something more than dirt under the industrial juggernaut. And especially to learn the lesson that the labor question is a political question.

Here it would be well to mention two matters. It is only by the broadening of their mental horizon that the workers fit themselves to cope with the critical situations that must arise in the passing of capitalism and the coming of Socialism. In such days the workers will profit by the tragedy of the Paris Commune where, because of a constellation of incidents, due to being unprepared and misjudging the nature of their enemy, the first attempt of the workers at self-rule was drowned in a sea of their blood. Secondly, with the complete ascendancy of the capitalist class, intellectual progress ceases or, worse still, degenerates into intellectual prostitution. Carnegie libraries, bearing the stain of Homestead, fawn upon the searcher after knowledge. To the workers, therefore, falls the mantle of culture, as well as that of economics. It is for them to decide the destiny of the arts and sciences, as of governments and nations.

It is because the workers must be aware of these facts, aware of their position as the dependent class, aware that they are involved in a class struggle and must strike for freedom as a class, that so much emphasis is placed by the Socialist upon class consciousness. This does not mean that only those who are of the working class can understand the toilers' posi-

tion, their attitude and movement, nor, carrying this idea further, that only the most degraded, most destitute and most enslaved section of the working class can adequately express the ideals of the coming democracy. In respect to the latter, quite the contrary is true. Whatever shortcoming may mark the attempt upon the part of those from the upper class to view social relations from the standpoint of the lower class, the cause of the toiler would indeed be hopeless if it depended upon the lowest element, the dregs of the slums. But it does mean that, allowing for all personal equations, a certain tendency is crystallizing in the working class, an attitude of dissatisfaction with and opposition to present property relations, that refuses to accept the ethical codes of the ruling class and existing order, that weighs civilization not by what is but by what might be, that sounds the note not of content but of discontent, that has as its aim the control of government and industry by the world's workers. It is this tendency, this thought and attitude, that we call the class-consciousness of the working class.

In past times the working class did the fighting for the other classes. Today individuals, who are not strictly speaking of the working class, throw their fortune in with the toilers. This is especially true of men engaged in the professions, small business and agriculture, the so-called middle class. Farmers join forces with the industrial workers, country unites with city, against their common enemy,

the plutocracy. The nucleus of the army of revolt consists of the workers of the highly centralized industries, because the very nature of their labor cultivates the spirit of solidarity. Nor is the class struggle confined to one country. In every land where capitalism lifts its head, irrespective of the form of government, creeds or races, there the modern class war rages, there the crack of the militiaman's rifle is heard, there the jail door swings open for the worker, there the courts are invoked to bind and gag the striker—and there is a branch of the international Socialist movement. Slowly the giant Labor bestirs himself. He is no longer blind. He has found his eyes. Over the bosom of the earth sweeps the spirit of the Social Revolution. Beneath the red flag, with the feeling that when they free themselves they free all humanity, rally the forces of the coming democracy, hearkening to the clarion call first sounded by Marx and Engels: "Workers of all countries, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains: You have a world to gain!"

CHAPTER V

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Man is declared to be what heredity and environment make him. Of these two factors, so far as the individual goes, heredity is constant, environment varies. While no man can alter his heredity, environment is ever changing. Environment is, besides, the more important factor and helps shape the heredity of the future. This is admitted by people of all schools of thought. Otherwise there would be no reason in their practical proposals. We must, then, ascertain what part of the environment exercises the greatest influence on the individual and society, and what influences are at work changing the environment.

"Self-preservation is the first law of nature," say the scientists. To satisfy hunger, protect the body and shelter it from the elements, to obtain a livelihood—that is the first consideration in human society as in the animal kingdom. However unromantic it may be, our physical requirements must be attended to first of all. The material comes before the mental, the practical sways the theoretical.

In every period of history, therefore, the means employed to secure a livelihood, and the social relations which necessarily followed,

produced in great part, the ideas and tendencies of the time. As people altered the method of winning their existence, so their relations and theories changed. An examination of the trend of institutions, whether political, philosophical or social, shows that the changes they have undergone can be accounted for only by referring to the changes in material conditions. This is historical materialism, or economic determinism, as it is sometimes called, another of the discoveries of Karl Marx.

Here is the oft-quoted statement of Marx: "The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression of the same thing—with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed."

We need hardly caution the reader against the fallacy that an individual's notions are determined by his own economic condition. We are dealing with man collectively, in so-

society, and society has laws peculiar to itself, laws governing its motion which are affected very little by the independent ideas and actions of individuals.

Let us also hasten to say that the material is not the only factor. It is the first factor and the foremost one, but there are others. True enough is it that all factors except the material, taken together, cannot explain the evolution of society, while material conditions alone can do so, although very roughly. In practice, material conditions exert the preponderating influence, while the other factors serve largely to temper or intensify that influence.

Historical materialism does not eliminate these factors. It embraces them, although it does discount the importance usually assigned them by other thinkers. The Socialist can say with the poet:

"I hold the world but as the world, Gratiano;
A stage where every man must play a part."

Generally speaking, we are concerned with the part each man plays only insofar as his part is a more or less common one. We are interested, especially, in ideas and movements of a general character, such as are a social quantity, signifying that a social cause has brought them into being. We do not deny that there have been great men, "heroes," as Carlyle calls them, men who seem to be intellectual giants by comparison with their fellow men. But even these "heroes" did not

create themselves. They are not the result of "spontaneous creation." Like everybody else, they issue from the womb of time and are under obligation to circumstances for pretty much all they are. However encyclopedic their minds, however colossal their genius, their greatness comes out of the material at hand. "One swallow does not make a summer," and one great man does not, single handed, make history. Napoleon said of himself: "I have always marched with the opinions of great masses and with events.... I am the creature of circumstances." We all recognize the importance of historical conditions when we say: "This man was wise in his day and generation." Conditions make the man of the hour, a great deal more so than the man of the hour modifies conditions.

Nor need it be denied that much of history may be regarded as a conflict between democracy and aristocracy. Yet probing a little deeper will show that material conditions, in the greatest measure, decided whether that conflict took a religious, political or economic turn.

Historical materialism does not imply that the institutions of every epoch are bound to assume the same shape and pass through the same process of development all over the world. Progress may be retarded or accelerated according to the peculiarities, customs and traditions of a people. More than that, to quote Kautsky: "Every method of pro-

duction is connected not only with particular tools and particular social relations, but also with the particular content of knowledge, with particular powers of intelligence, a particular view of cause and effect, a particular logic, in short, a particular form of thought." So, many a workingman to day imagines he is living in the America of half a century ago, before the rise of modern industry—which accounts for his voting the Republican or Democratic ticket because his father or grandfather did. When the ideas of the working class catch up with existing conditions, there will probably be a social revolution.

Again, as Labriola tells us, Italy for a time fell out of the course of the nations. Japan, on the other hand, profited by the experience of other countries; it is possible, although not altogether probable, that Russia will pass from a state of feudalism into Socialism without experiencing very much of capitalism. The Socialist movements of different countries assume different aspects, although they are actuated by a common ideal.

Nor is historical materialism a new pantheism, counting the hairs of one's head and watching the fall of a sparrow. It is satisfied with explaining the questions of greater moment, tracing the evolution of society from savagery to civilization, explaining political disturbances, waves of reform and religion, and the rise and decline of philosophies and nations.

Historical materialism, in declaring that

ideas change with the change in material conditions, runs counter to the theory that ideas create themselves or are lassoed by the individual out of the sea of consciousness which always was and will be. It also runs counter to the theory that certain ideas and principles are eternally true, irrespective of time and place. As Marx says: "Thus these ideas, these categories, are not more eternal than the relations which they express. They are historical and transitory products." This is, of course, a rude shock to the budding philosophers who, every three or four years, rediscover the eternal principles of social harmony. But that cannot be helped.

It is by the test of history that the theory of historical materialism must stand or fall. History will tell us whether institutions are transitory and in what degree they correspond to the methods employed in securing a livelihood.

For example, nowadays we are asked to regard property of a certain kind as "private and sacred." Yet this was not always so. Lafargue tells us that "a citizen of Sparta was entitled without permission to ride the horses, use the dogs, and even dispose of the slaves of any other Spartan." Imagine pursuing the chase with the dogs, horses and servants of one of our social bluebloods, without so much as "by your leave!" As to the ephemeral nature of property, Atkinson, the American economist, goes so far as to say: "The only capital which

is of permanent value is immaterial—the experience of generations and the development of science." Indeed not only is right in the possession of things not eternal, but is dependent upon man-made law. So Lafargue quotes Locke, the English philosopher: "Where there is no property there is no injustice." Cooley, an American authority upon constitutional law, declares: "That is property which is recognized as such by law, and nothing else is or can be. Property and law are born and must die together. Before the laws there was no property, take away the laws, all property ceases." Private ownership, therefore, is not something perpetual, but is a temporary arrangement subject to social needs. On this point Cooley says: "The courts... seem to have laid down the broad doctrine that where private property is devoted to a public use it is subject to public regulation." Public necessity has gone further than regulation. In the coal strike of 1902 several mayors confiscated carloads of coal with no pretense of according the owners "due process of law."

Speaking of the "sacredness" of private property, the following utterance is interesting, in that it concerns a notoriously lawless destruction of the property of certain eminently respectable gentlemen. The reference is to the Boston Tea Party. "This is the most magnificent movement of all. There is a dignity, a majesty, a sublimity in this last effort of the patriots that I greatly admire.... This de-

struction of the tea is so bold, so daring, so fixed, so intrepid, and inflexible, and it must have so important consequences and so lasting, that I cannot but consider it an epoch in history." This attack upon the sacredness of private property was not the deed of some sacrilegious firebrand, but the cold, measured syllables of that austere Puritan and prim jurist, John Adams. Again, by the stroke of a pen, Lincoln confiscated millions of dollars of southern property. So much for the sacredness of property.

Justice, ethics, equality, liberty—all these have significance only as regards specific historical conditions. When severed from those conditions they are either meaningless or, as often as not, serve reactionary purposes. Labriola sums it up when he says: "Ideas do not fall from heaven; and, what is more, like the other products of human activity, they are formed in given circumstances, in the precise fullness of time, through the action of definite needs, thanks to the repeated attempts at their satisfaction, and by the discovery of such and such other means of proof which are, as it were, the instruments of their production and their elaboration." Thus our modern unctuous moralists tell the workers: "Think more of your duties and less of your rights." Which is exquisite slave economy. Thus a professor of political economy recently ventured the opinion that the labor problem might be solved if married women, together with their husbands,

went to work. Which, under present conditions, is either irony or impudence, and a fair sample of non-Socialist economy. What influence material conditions exert upon creeds is witnessed in the decline in America of Judaism, the faith of a people who have heretofore preserved their race identity despite centuries of persecution.

It is a commonplace that "when poverty comes in at the door, love flies out the window." That marriage is not necessarily a moral and spiritual union Professor Seligman shows, when he says: "The earliest division of labor rests on the principle that the female attends to the vegetable sustenance, the man to the animal diet, and on this fundamental distinction all the other social arrangements are built up. Marriage, for a long time, is not an ethical community of ideal interests, but very largely an economic or labor relation." It has been observed that the number of marriages fluctuates with the price of food. The agitation against race-suicide springs from an economic motive.

Behind those companions in iniquity and hypocrisy, "our manifest destiny" and "benevolent assimilation"—at the point of the bayonet—lurk economic interests. Such men as Carl Schurz and Wendell Phillips knew this. Schurz saw that the Civil War was a conflict between the industrial ambitions of the North and the South, between cotton and iron. And Phillips said: "It is not always, however, ideas or moral

principles that push the world forward. Selfish interests play a large part in the work. Our Revolution of 1776 succeeded because trade and wealth joined hands with principle and enthusiasm—a union rare in the history of revolutions. Northern merchants fretted at England's refusal to allow them direct trade with Holland and the West Indies. Virginia planters, heavily mortgaged, welcomed anything which would postpone payment of their debts—a motive that doubtless avails largely among Secessionists now." Loria declares that statistics prove 258 out of 286 wars to be distinctly due to economic causes, while in the remainder, apparently fought on religious grounds, economic influences were at work but obscured. And Professor Seth Low, among others, at a congress of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in 1905, declared that all wars are commercial in origin.

Every important change in the method of securing a living is accompanied by a class struggle in which a new class or a class formerly subordinate forces itself to the front. The class character of society, indicated in all institutions, is especially evident in examining legislation. When we declare that Pennsylvania is the property of the railroad of that name, we do not mean that most of its officials are on the payroll of the corporation. Some probably are, as recent disclosures show, just as the Chicago University is coming to be considered a by-product of Standard Oil. We

mean that, wittingly or not, the interests of that railroad are so well served by the legislators of Pennsylvania as to make it appear that this is their primary reason for holding office.

The attitude toward tariff legislation has undergone an interesting transformation. In the early days John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, voted for protection for the South. When the manufacturing class of the North came into control, they became the ardent advocates of a high tariff. For years the policy of the government was, practically, to "stand pat." Now that capital is becoming international, reciprocity and tariff revision are on the carpet. The more capital extends its grip internationally the surer the tendency toward free trade. In the same way public opinion in regard to the trust has changed. In the days of Mark Hanna, "there were no trusts." Later, there were "good trusts and bad trusts." We are already at the point when large investments are immune, when President Roosevelt permitted the Steel Trust to assimilate the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company and informed the Senate that it was none of their business. Competition is no longer the life of trade. Trade is the death of competition.

Reform measures also depend upon circumstance. Very often the demand of a subjugated class is conceded by the ruling class, because the latter profits by the measure. For example, rate legislation and federal licensing

of corporations. In the days of competition which existed some generations ago, but not since, uniform rate legislation might have secured equity among common carriers and, by preventing discrimination, might have interfered with the tendency toward trustification. But today, when the larger industries are monopolistic and inter-related, a uniform rate, especially if high enough,—and federal commissions are advocates of higher rates—would complete the work of driving men of small means out of business, while changing only the pocket into which the general profits would flow for the trusts. So federal licensing of corporations means that the federal government lends its hand to large enterprise, because only large enterprise does a national business, thus protecting it against the encroachment of such state legislatures as happen to be in control of its enemies.

The class character of society is more pronounced as between the capitalist class and the working class. Thus, to take something without rendering an equivalent is purely a class wrong. For a worker to snatch a loaf of bread to appease his hunger is punishable and punished by law; for a capitalist to exploit the same worker mercilessly is good business. Because the worker is a producer, dealing with the realities of life, laboring with Mother Earth to minister to the comfort of the race, his conceptions are generally antagonistic to those of the ruling class, who render no useful service and whose privilege is based upon legal fiction.

Here many able men who consider themselves exponents of Marxian historical materialism, Professor Seligman among them, fall short of the mark. For historical materialism explains how historical materialism came to be.

We need not pause to consider the school book notion that history writing is an accurate record of events. To be something more than chronology, events must be interpreted, arranged as to cause and effect. And second thought will convince even the school child that the stirring times of 1776 have heretofore made an entirely different impression upon American as against English historians. In the higher schools the unscientific method is rapidly becoming obsolete. It is recognized that the writing of history does depend upon the standpoint of the historian. It was, therefore, no accidental coincidence, as Professor Seligman thinks, that Marx, who stood political economy right side up, should turn right side up the philosophy of history and become a Socialist. That is why in Marx the theories of surplus value, class struggle and historical materialism are co-ordinated and united; that is why historical materialism, in its fullest and completest sense—its only proper sense—is the method and the weapon of the working class, coming only with the rise of the modern labor movement. That is why Marx and Engels were Socialists, instead of closet philosophers, why they were the guiding spirits in the first international organization of the working class, why they were able to map out in the

rough the line of march the working class movement has since taken and is taking.

But if the professor's tendency is to castrate historical materialism, by depriving it of its revolutionary character and its corollary, the class struggle, in an attempt to make the theory more "moderate," Loria goes him one better as an "extremist" in the other direction. So Loria says: "Capitalist property is not a natural phenomenon but a violation of law, both human and divine—the impossible erected into a system." With Loria, as with many non-Socialists, the "unnatural" is here in full bloom. Which is perfectly natural—for Loria. Well, as capitalist property is "unnatural" and "a violation of law, both human and divine," the sooner it goes the better, one would suppose. But, naturally or otherwise, Loria argues the contrary. "In the first place there is abundant opportunity to ameliorate the sanitary and economic condition of the poorer classes without in the least interfering with the rights of property, and measures of this kind are in no way excluded by our theory." For Loria, capitalist property, which came into being by the violation of law and ethics, is nevertheless sacred, and his plans for ameliorating the condition of the workers do not in the least interfere with the "rights of property." The only ray of hope he holds out is this: "The bipartition of the revenues is the salvation of the proletariat." The workers, consequently, can find relief only in keeping the landed aristocracy and the capitalist class at

each other's throats. What the working class are to do when landed aristocrats and capitalists together clutch the workers' throats, Loria does not say. Nor does Loria consider that the working class, who are the most numerous class and socially the most necessary class, might decide to rid themselves both of landlords and capitalists. Loria and Professor Seligman occupy a position as regards historical interpretation similar to that of Feuerbach in philosophy. Backward they are historical materialists; forward, ideologists.

Historical materialism not only accounts for itself, as well as for the rise of contrary theories, but foretells its own passing. For it may be said with some assurance that with the end of capitalism, the influence of material conditions on society will be reduced to a minimum. Marx's method, the examination of events and ideas by the light of historical fact instead of fancy, will likely endure much longer.

Meanwhile the Socialist goes about his business of studying the anatomy of present society, interpreting history and organizing the working class for the coming change.

For historical materialism is not a form of fatalism. Not only does it recognize the influence of intellectual forces, but declares that their importance grows with time. To be aware of the direction and rate of the power moving society, to be conscious of the necessity for class action, is the duty imposed upon the workers. So it is that as the Socialist move-

ment grows and makes progress, more and more does it display its class character. And because of this fact can we say: Socialism is inevitable!

That, too, explains why historical materialism has come to be regarded as one of the most formidable weapons in the arsenal of the Socialist. With its aid will the mission of the workers to conquer the productive forces be accomplished, so that thereafter intellect will control destiny and society will consciously mold its environment.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIALISM AND SCIENCE

Man is not the product of social conditions alone. He is a human being, and traces of the lower animals are still very decided in him. As a human being, albeit endowed with considerably more mentality than the other animals, he has tried to explain the physical universe about him with mingled fear, wonder and perplexity. He has worshipped the sun, moon, other animals, his own organs and idols. He has imagined his gods to inhabit everything that grows, the elements, and the vast firmament that transcends his powers of conception. He celebrates by fast or feast such perennial phenomena as the coming of the seasons. He greets sunrise and sunset with prayer and is in the throes of the problem of immortality. And these things exert no little influence in shaping customs, traditions and traits of character; they make no little impression upon social arrangements.

Progress along this line is made by finding a natural explanation for what was formerly deemed supernatural. Science replaces faith. Knowledge ousts superstition.

"Science," say the scientists, "is general knowledge systematized." Science consists of

properly arranged facts and theories and laws in regard to what passes about us.

The workingman does something like this at his bench or machine. Thus, before weaving, it is necessary to sort the cotton from the wool, material of one texture from that of another, that of one color from that of a different color, and that of expensive dye from that of an inferior grade. In like manner, science takes facts that are generally known, or should be generally known, and sorts them out according to the points of resemblance and distinction.

Science regards nothing as stationary. Everything is in a condition of flow; in the moment that it is one thing, it is becoming something else. "The present is the child of the past, but it is the parent of the future." As so often has been said, the only thing constant in nature is the law of perpetual change.

This law of perpetual change we see in operation all about us. Mother Earth shrugs her shoulders and mountain ranges rise or fall; she puckers up her lips, and ocean currents swerve around the continents. When she is cramped for room and stretches herself, there is likely to be an earthquake and perhaps tens of thousands of lives are lost and cities are demolished in a twinkling. Volcanoes remain to warn man of the restlessness of nature.

But while everything changes its form, nothing is ever lost. Life and death are companions throughout existence, the crest and trough of the wave of time. One makes way for the other. What perishes fertilizes what

is about to be born ; the dead, by giving life to the living, becomes the substance of the living Shakespeare uses this idea in one of his plays:

"Hamlet. A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm.

King. What dost thou mean by this?

Hamlet. Nothing but to show you how a king may go a process through the guts of a beggar."

In proof that we are related to all about us, Moore declares that more than two-thirds of the weight of the human body is made up of oxygen, a gas which forms one-fifth of the weight of the air, more than eight-ninths of that of the sea, and forty-seven per cent. of the superficial solids of the earth.

Nothing is constant. Everything changes. But that is all it does. Matter may be shifted about, but it cannot be lost. And however much force may be brought into play, only its form is altered. It is not destroyed. So far as we can see, the matter and force about us have always been and will always be. There was no beginning, and there will be no end. They are everlasting.

This old earth of ours has been changing for quite awhile. Boelsche thinks it is a million years old. And there is no telling how many millions of times the stuff of which our world is made was the stuff of other worlds or stars. We know ours was not the first or the last created. Fitch declares that it is only a millionth part in bulk of the solar system—our

sun, planets and their moons—and we know that the solar system is probably only a millionth part of the dust of the heavens. So that our ball of toil and trouble is only a grain in the celestial sandstorm. And the earth was here for the greater part of its million years before the being we call man arrived. Again quoting Moore: "Man is not the end, he is but an incident, of the infinite elaborations of Time and Space."

It may be accepted for a certainty that man was not created as man. He is the outcome of animals lower in the scale, which fact Darwin first dwelt upon. Evidence is plentiful on this score. Huxley, in "*Man's Place in Nature*," tells of the ties between man and the manlike apes, man's next of kin. Thus, there is greater difference among men's brains than there is between those of man and the gorilla. The difference in skull and skeleton between man and the gorilla are of smaller value than that between the gorilla and some other apes. The same is true of the dentition. Man in the embryonical stage is nearer to the ape than the ape is to the dog. Bebel declares that monkeys are the only beings, besides man, in whom the sexual impulse is not fixed to certain periods.

The process of the human embryo, from egg to ego, has the appearance of a panorama of the biological scale. Dr. Weisler, in his work on "*Embryology*," tells us that at the twenty-fifth day the embryo presents a well-developed tail. While maternal influences cease at the second week, up to the fourth

week the heart of the human embryo is that which is the permanent condition of fishes. The nails begin in claw-like projections. In the seventh month, the lanugo, or embryonal down, makes its appearance, covers the surface of practically the whole body, and disappears in the eighth month. This is a relic of the days when what is now man was a hair-covered animal. Fitch gives a list of rudimentary organs, which were once useful in the animal ancestors of man, but are now rather harmful. Such is the vermiform appendix. Boelsche declares that the blood of the chimpanzee may be mixed with that of man without harm, which is the severest test, as bloods of different species act as poisons toward each other. Boelsche follows the clues from man, step by step, down to the very beginning of life, the primordial cell.

All of man's organs and their functions hark back to the remote past. "Life was born blind, just as many animals are to this day, but it was gradually prepared for sight," says Dr. Meyer. Scientists go even further. Francé declares: "The plant possesses everything that distinguishes a living creature—movement, sensation, the most violent reaction against abuse, and most ardent gratitude for favors—if we will but take sufficient time to wait with loving patience for its sweet and gentle answers to our stormy questions." While rooted to the ground it nevertheless has power, in a measure, to adapt itself to external agencies. It feels "light-hunger," not unlike the

light-hunger in man which Ibsen makes the climax of his great morbid play "Ghosts." Again, more than five hundred varieties of plants devour insects. Plants also have a refined sense of smell, taste and location; there is the beginning of a nervous system, and a tendency toward division of labor, instinct, perception and soul. So Francé concludes: "Even if all our hopes are not realized, we have brought away a mighty knowledge that reaches down into the very depth of all being; the certainty that the life of the plants is one with that of animals, and with that of ourselves."

It is difficult to draw a sharp line between man and the other animals. Grant Allen, in the "New Hedonism," thinks that what elevates man above his fellow creatures is ethics, intellect and the sense of beauty. Yet it is quite certain that many birds find considerable enjoyment in a harmonious color scheme, while savages are not very far superior to the ingenious animals, such as the ant, in ethics and intellect. Franklin called man the tool-using animal. And while Kautsky declares that, "Neither as a thinking nor as a moral being is man essentially different from the animals," he goes on to say that "what, however, alone distinguishes the former is the production of tools, which serve for production, for defence or attack.... With the production of the means of production, the animal man begins to become the human man; with that he breaks away from the animal world to found

his own empire, an empire with its own kind of development, which is wholly unknown in the rest of nature, and to which nothing similar is to be found there."

Everything changes. Man has evolved out of lower animals, and the plants are likely his distant relatives. Arthur Morrow Lewis sketches the modern theories of organic transformation in this wise: "Lamarck was the first to present the theory of evolution in a thoroughly scientific manner. Then Darwin discovered the great principle which rules the evolution of organisms; the principle of 'natural selection.' Then Weismann repudiated current ideas as to how the fittest 'arrived,' or 'originated,' and presented in their place a theory of his own, which is still under discussion. De Vries raised the question as to whether new species 'arrive' by a gradual accumulation of tiny changes, or by sudden leaps—mutations—and demonstrated the latter by his experiments with the evening primrose."

Darwin's theory, regarded as epoch-making in science, is: Natural selection by the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. Or, as it is commonly put, nature performs her wonders through the desire for food and offspring, hunger and love. It is the special merit of Darwin that his theory was the first satisfactory attempt to interpret the activity of organic beings, and to explain why they change. And Lester F. Ward tells us: "Science is mainly interpretation."

The question of interpretation is a very broad one. It flows out of many things. Thus Darwin acknowledges he was influenced by the now discredited theory of Malthus that more human beings are born than sustenance can be provided for. Both Darwin and Malthus, in turn, were influenced in their interpretation by such circumstances as the condition of England of their time. So that, to-day, the Malthusian theory is practically abandoned, while the Darwinian theory has been amplified in many directions. Thus, Kropotkin shows the importance of "mutual aid" in the struggle for existence, repudiating the notion that it is a struggle of each against all.

Herbert Spencer first formulated a theory of evolution that embraced the many fields covered by science. He declares evolution to consist of the "integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." This is all-inclusive, but gives no hint of the particular laws of development governing one science as against another, astronomy as against physics, or biology as against sociology. And a very serious mistake is made in imagining that laws belonging to one science apply equally to another. This is especially so of biology, organic science, and sociology, social science,

While man, as an individual, belongs with the other forms of life; man, the social being, has made a departure from the other forms along independent lines. In one case evolution is a spiral that rises back of the lowly worm and sweeps upward in ever widening curves until it embraces the universe; in the other case, it begins in savagery, moves upward through barbarism and civilization to enlightenment.

The names of Darwin and Spencer must be bracketed with that of Marx. If science is mainly interpretation, let it be remembered that the same year Darwin's "Origin of Species" appeared, 1859, Marx, in his "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," first fully formulated his theory of historical materialism, and employed it to trace the development of a number of economic theories. And historical materialism not only interprets the intricate phenomena of social evolution, but also accounts for the intellectual superstructure, explaining, for instance, the rise of the Darwinian school. For this reason modern Socialism is called scientific. It does not detract from the glory of any of these three giants of thought to group them together, as Ferri has done.

Just as the biologist declares that nothing happens by accident, that every phenomenon answers to the test of cause and effect, that the manifestation we call free will is dependent upon everything else, so the Socialist declares

that nothing happens by chance in society, that all is part of a more or less well ascertained process making for better social order. Just as the biologist refuses to ignore the struggle for existence, but declares this to be a very important fact in biology, so the Socialist refuses to overlook the struggle of classes in society, but declares this to be its most important fact. Just as the biologist traces the descent of man, shows how intimately he is related to his next of kin in the animal province, and declares that man partakes of what there is in his ancestors down to the primordial cell, so the Socialist traces the evolution of society, showing that institutions are largely the reflex of material needs, and that one social system makes way for another.

Science, like the Socialist movement, is international. It is no respecter of person or place. Under a certain atmospheric pressure and temperature, vapor condenses into rain. It does so in America; it does so in China. To exploit labor, the means of production must be owned as private property. It is so in America; it is so in China. Because like causes produce like results, when an industrial depression sets in over the world, we know it is not due to the perversity of a few Wall street bankers, but to international unpaid labor.

So we know that some tremendous force was at work when, for example, the generation that saw the end of the 19th century witnessed the inauguration of the factory system, political

disturbances in America and France, new departures in economics, medicine, treatment of the insane, criminology, psychology, philosophy and science. Historical materialism declares that the primary cause was the clash between the rising capitalists, whose right bower science then was, and the feudal aristocracy. Again, in the middle of the century, when the revolutions of 1848 placed the capitalist class completely on the throne, there was an impetus given to science that brought forth the theory of organic evolution, and that also brought forth the scientists of the working class with the theory of social evolution. And just as Alfred Russell Wallace arrived at the theory of natural selection independently of Darwin, so Engels and, later, Morgan arrived at the theory of historical materialism independently of Marx—showing that both theories were the ripe fruit of circumstance.

Science and Socialism belong together. For, just as, in ancient times, potentates slew bearers of evil tidings, so modern scientists and Socialists have been execrated, upon the supposition that there would be no evolution if science did not say so, and there would be no class struggle if Socialists did not direct our attention to it!

The capitalist class, having reached the zenith of their career, are opposed to further progress, and leave science to shift for herself. So one group of thinkers are losing themselves in the maze of “science for the sake

of science." Their work is sterile or, is apt to be devoted to designing automatic machinery and inventing labor-saving devices, rather than health and life-saving appliances. Their "expert" testimony depends upon how much they receive an hour and who their clients are. But another group acknowledge the consequences of the modern theories and subscribe to the program of Socialism. Theirs is known as proletarian science. It is founded upon a wider, fuller and completer materialism, for "materialism is," as Untermann says, "the handmaid of revolution, and without it no proletarian movement complies with the historical requirements of its evolution." It is because the proletarians, propertyless workers, "have nothing to lose but their chains," that they take hold of the guidon of science and carry it forward to fresh victories.

In proletarian science, evolution and revolution are twin forces. Every period of slow development, evolution, is followed by a complete change, a change of the fundamental principle, or revolution. Revolution paves the way for further evolution. To use a well-known illustration: The embryo is part of the mother, growing slowly through the placenta, until the moment of birth, the revolution. The child thenceforward is independent. It may live, even though the mother perish in the act of giving it birth. Applying this theory to past and present society, the Socialist holds that capitalism is evolving to the point where

a social revolution will bring forth a new order, Socialism. More than that, development along the same line increases in velocity as it reaches its culmination. Feudalism did not last nearly so many centuries as primitive communism did millenniums. Capitalism is not more than five centuries old at most; full-grown, hardly a century. Nowadays, new machinery is no sooner installed than it is ready for scrapping. The industrial revolution gave capitalism its spade. It began digging its grave when it annexed the Orient.

The theory of evolution by slow accumulation is, for that matter, hardly less radical than that of alternate evolution and revolution. Nature fulfills her purpose of corroding mountain ranges and augmenting the oceans as well by the sputtering spring as by the gushing geyser. To the lone traveler on the road at midnight, when all is wrapped in slumber, who stands, a mere speck, at the center of that infinite sphere strewn with stars, nature is just as majestic and terrible as when she drives a tidal wave that engulfs a city. The unpretentious sailor who remains at his post of duty, while the ship is sinking, and for thirty hours flashes wireless signals of distress, so saving hundreds of lives, is adding a little to the comradeship of labor and love that is the harbinger of the better time a-coming.

Objections raised in the name of science against Socialism, Ferri readily disposes of. Indeed, most of these overlook the fact that

Socialism is the only consistent explanation of social evolution. On the other hand, Massart and Vandervelde very satisfactorily compare parasitism in the social world with that in the organic. The slave master, the feudal lord, as well as minor celebrities, such as the pirate and brigand, belong to the past. In our own day we note that the higher a class is, the more useless is it. Financial capital domineers over landed property, transportation exacts tribute from manufacture and agriculture, while the capitalist class, as a class, exploit the workers. The capitalists perform little or no necessary functions; the purpose they serve is largely ornamental. They are parasites, merely devourers of the workers' substance, as Lafargue wittily pictures in his "Sale of an Appetite."

The word parasitism, by the way, was used in sociology before it was in biology. Here we may remark, philology, the science of language, is of considerable aid in the study of the origin of institutions. Lafargue, among Socialists, has made the best contribution in this respect. To cite a few instances: He tells us that the term capital dates back only to the 18th century, and that it has no equivalent in the Greek and Latin tongue, showing how absurd it is to speak of the capital of the savage. Likewise, a savage's notion of private property is substantially different from that of a civilized man's. The savage never reveals his name to a stranger; the civilized man has cards printed

especially for purposes of introduction. And, quoting the Jesuit Charlevoix: "The brotherly sentiments of the redskins are doubtless in part attributable to the fact that the words 'mine' and 'thine' are all unknown as yet to the savages."

What science teaches us, therefore, is that everything, organic and social, has passed and is passing through a continuous evolution and revolution up to higher forms. We are certain that those who have gone before did not dispose of the riddles of the universe, we are reasonably sure that we know a little more than they did. And we can be positive that we who live today have not uttered the final word,—they who come after us will add something to the jot of knowledge we possess.

Nature's plea for democracy is exemplified in the formula: "Science is general knowledge systematized." Not what some individual discovers and makes his secret, but what is commonly known and is an influence in common life, is of scientific value. Further, evolution granted, capitalism will pass away as did feudalism, chattel slavery and primitive communism. And if Socialism is not to be the outcome of the present drift toward industrial collectivism, what social order will?

When the class-society of today has given way to the fraternity of the world's workers, it does not mean that progress will cease, and that the human family will deteriorate into a low level of equals. On the contrary, to be

economically free, to rest assured that our material wants are disposed of for all time to come, and so end the conflict for bread, means that our energies and capabilities can then be directed toward intellectual pursuits, and that, consequently, man will begin a new course of development: he will describe a new arc in the spiral of intellectual splendor.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIALIST SOCIOLOGY

Sociology treats of human society. It studies man at his everyday affairs, aiming to tell how present social relations came to be and what direction they are taking. It is the youngest of the sciences, the most complex and, consequently, the least exact, so that its conclusions must be accepted only very tentatively. But, while still fumbling about in its swaddling clothes, it has come to be the most favored of the family, and is developing rapidly.

One thing, however, we may say at the outset. Sociology, to be worth anything, must be sociology—a survey that takes into consideration the play of social activities together. The study of some particularly curious or interesting phenomenon in society, by itself, is not sociology, any more so than is the study of one's finger nails anatomy. Many so-called sociologists do not accept this view. They believe they can handle one matter, such as child-labor, at a time, independently of the general social questions. Such sociology is of the stamp that imagines that our vagrancy problem can be solved by compelling tramps to move on—as if there were an edge of the

earth somewhere, over which they can be shoved.

Objection must also be made to the theory that society is merely a collection of individuals, and that if we know the "human nature" of one and multiply it by the whole number, we can thereby tell what society is. For every one is aware that we do things in our relations with our fellowmen that we would not dream of doing if we lived alone on some desert isle. Governments, for instance, are the consequence of certain social needs, and are very little influenced by the fact that here or there some person thinks they deprive him of his personal liberty. In turn, what may be to the individual's welfare or detriment, as an individual, is not necessarily to the welfare or detriment of society at large. Thus one man's extravagance often stimulates industrial activity; another one's thrift is often a menace to the general welfare. What counts, therefore, is the sum total of our activities as members of society.

Then what is society? Spencer called it an organism. It has many of the attributes of an organism. Yet it has not developed out of any other organism, having been "artificially" created and may be so destroyed. It is not a true organism. Again, it has been called an organization. This is less satisfactory. The hold society has upon us is more binding, more deeply seated, than that of an arbitrary association. It is part of our very makeup. Even

hermits like to be within calling distance of their fellow-men, and hermits are quite rare. Society is more of an organism than an organization.

Human society differs from other organisms because of the influence of the mind of man. By the exercise of this faculty, man has scaled heights of achievement far beyond anything attained in the animal kingdom, and has acquired the pursuit of happiness as an end in itself. It is the use of mechanical tools and the desire for pleasure, either independently of or in conjunction with the will to live that, according to Lester F. Ward, distinguishes man from the other animals and raises human society above animal gregariousness. It may be observed that Ward probably unconsciously borrows the thought of pursuit of happiness from the Declaration of Independence, a document that the invention of superior mechanical tools was not a little responsible for. Ward takes up the influence of mind especially in his "Psychic Factors of Civilization." "The environment transforms the animal, while man transforms the environment," he says. "The fundamental principle of biology is natural selection, that of sociology is artificial selection." And of the struggle for existence in society, he declares: "In no proper sense is it true that the fittest survive." In his "Applied Sociology" he goes even further. Here he says: "The intellectual factor completely reverses the biologic law. The whole effort of intelligence

has been to do away with the struggle for existence... The law of nature has been neutralized in the physical world and civilization is the result. It is still in force in the social and especially in the economic world, but this is because the method of mind has not been applied to these departments of nature." The mind is such an important factor that modern sociology flows out of psychology, which, in turn, rests upon biology. For this reason, too, the social environment is spoken of as "artificial" (for want of a better word), to distinguish it from the purely organic and physical environment.

How did society come to be? For information on this point we turn to Lewis Morgan, whose great work, "Ancient Society," is a storehouse of data describing what has gone before. Just as the human embryo, in its development, epitomizes organic evolution, so Morgan found, largely through his investigations among the Iroquois nation of American Indians, in studying their institutions, customs and traditions, that civilized man is a resume of social evolution.

Morgan divides savagery and barbarism into three periods each. Supposing man, as such, to have existed now a hundred thousand years upon earth, Morgan thinks it fair to say that sixty thousand years were spent in savagery, twenty thousand in older barbarism, fifteen thousand in its two later periods, leaving about five thousand for civilization. If any-

thing, Morgan underestimates the time society has existed. In making these divisions, Morgan says: "It is probable that the successive arts of subsistence which arose at long intervals will ultimately, from the great influence they must have exercised upon the condition of mankind, afford the most satisfactory bases for these divisions."

The earliest form of social arrangement known is that of communism, when the land and almost everything else was held in common. And it is speaking of this time that Morgan says: "The principal institutions of mankind originated in savagery, were developed in barbarism, and are maturing in civilization." The author mentions among these institutions, "the rudiments of language, of government, of the family, of religion, of house architecture and of property, together with the principal germs of the arts of life."

The first division of labor was between man and woman. While man was the hunter and warrior, woman both delved and spun, despite the old saying. The many accomplishments of prehistoric woman, O. T. Mason has recounted for us in his "Woman's Share in Primitive Culture." Particularly should be noted the making of pottery, which introduced village life and marked the transition from savagery to barbarism; also the domestication of animals, the last step but one before civilization.

The first organization of society was upon

the basis of sex. Husband and wife belonged to different gentes. Morgan defines a gens as a group, "descended from the same common ancestor, distinguished by a gentile name, and bound together by affinities of blood." From the same root we derive the words generate and generation. Several gentes made a tribe through the medium of phratries, and several tribes made a confederacy and nation, each fulfilling certain purposes and exercising certain administrative rights, although of a different nature from those of political government.

Political government, founded upon property and division of territory, with its economic classes, tax gatherers and police powers, was an innovation that disrupted tribal society. It is not yet two and a half thousand years old, and, so Morgan says, "although apparently a simple idea, it required centuries of time and a complete revolution of pre-existing conceptions of government to accomplish the result." Morgan declares private property to be the principal cause of the change. Thus he says, in regard to Athens: "The useful arts had attained a very considerable development; commerce on the sea had become a national interest; agriculture and manufactures were well advanced; and written composition in verse had commenced. They were in fact a civilized people, and had been for two centuries." Says Engels, in his "Origin of the Family," which follows "Ancient Society:" "Liberty, equality

and fraternity, though never formulated, were cardinal principles of the gens." For a long while the wife perforce was the head of the family. "In all societies in which the matriarchal form of the family has maintained itself," Lafargue tells us, "we find landed property held by the woman.... So long as property was a cause of subjection, it was abandoned to the woman; but no sooner had it become a means of emancipation and supremacy in the family and society than man tore it from her."

The family has undergone several changes. Morgan acquaints us with five forms, each representing a different period: The consanguine, the intermarriage of brothers and sisters in a group, giving the Malayan system of relationship; the punaluan, the inter-marriage of several brothers to each other's wives in a group, and several sisters to each other's husbands in a group, creating the Turanian system of relationships; the syndyasmian family, the pairing of one male with one female, with no exclusive habitation and with separation at the option of either; the patriarchal family, the marriage of one man to several wives; the monogamian family, consisting of one man and one woman, creating the monogamian system of relationships. Evidence of the first two forms still remains, although they belong to savagery and precede the institution of the gens. The third form is still extant among barbarians; Engels tells us it existed among

the Irish and Welsh as recently as the eleventh century. The patriarchal form is that of pastoral tribes, notably the Hebrews of biblical times. It exists among the Mormons today. The last form is peculiar to private property and civilization. Here again, as Morgan says: "Property becomes sufficiently powerful in its influence to touch the organic structure of society."

The immorality of our day is, to a great extent, a reversion to what was formerly normal. Immorality is atavistic. Bigamy, the double code of sexual morals and one-sided secret arrangements especially prevalent among the upper class, are of this character. As a general rule, frequency of relapse to a former sexual relation depends upon how nearly it approaches the present one. By what we can gather from evolution, the family of the future is likely to be one of pure monogamy.

It has been well said that the freedom of any society may be measured by the freedom of its women. "Woman was the first human being to come into bondage; she was a slave before the male slave existed," says Bebel. Let us remember that as late as the sixteenth century—after Sappho had twanged her lyre and when Shakespeare was about to immortalize Desdemona, Lady Macbeth, Ophelia and Portia—serious men were still in doubt as to whether or not woman has a soul, whereas Havelock Ellis tells us: "It can scarcely be said that the study of the brain from the

present point of view leads to the revelation of any important sexual distinctions." More than a century woman has been struggling for the right of suffrage, a right she enjoyed during barbarism. Step by step she has fought her way up, bearing alone the sacred burden of motherhood and yet deemed unworthy to share the liberties of her offspring. At the present time over five million women in America, a large proportion of whom are married, crowd the labor market. Like man they are compelled to pervert mind and muscle for bread, while about half a million are thrust in the mire even more deeply than man. The woman problem is most decidedly part of the social problem, although women are hindered in assisting at its solution.

Differences there are between the sexes, differences that reach down into our very being. Havelock Ellis, after considering the matter, sums it up in this fashion: "All the evidence brought together points, with varying degrees of certainty, to the same conclusion—the greater physical frailty of men, the greater tenacity of life in women." "From an organic standpoint, therefore, women represent the more stable and conservative element in evolution." "In each sex there are undeveloped organs and functions which in the other sex are developed." Ward has this to say: "The dominant characteristic of the male faculty is courage, that of the female, prudence." And, "In the realm of the intellect, where he would

fain reign supreme, she has proved herself fully his equal and is entitled to her share of whatever credit attaches to human progress thereby achieved." Edward Carpenter, in "Love's Coming of Age," pays this tribute: "Since she keeps to the great lines of evolution and is less biased and influenced by the momentary currents of the day; since her life is bound up with the life of the child; since in a way she is nearer the child herself, and nearer to the savage; it is to her that Man, after his excursions and wanderings, mental and physical, continually tends to return as to his primitive home and resting place, to restore his balance, to find his centre of life and to draw stores of energy and inspiration for fresh conquests of the outer world." It is the male who searches for new worlds to win, while the female conserves what has been gained. Organic inequalities tend to make the sexes complement each other and so works for the betterment of man and woman. Each is realized only through a happy union with the other. There is no room for social distinctions.

As deplorable as the condition of woman is today, that of the child is still worse. Two millions of youngsters are turning their frail bodies into profit in America; thousands of them die before arriving at maturity. Says Charlotte Perkins Gilman, in her work, "Concerning Children": "As members of society, we find they have received almost no attention. They are treated as members of the family by

the family, but not even recognized as belonging to society.... Except for these rare cases of special playgrounds, except for the quite generous array of school houses and a few orphan asylums and kindred institutions, there are no indications in city or country that there are such people as children." And here it may be inserted that, whatever element of truth there may be in the witticism that Bernard Shaw writes plays for the opportunity it affords him of penning prefaces, true enough is it that many such a sociological contribution as Spencer's "Education" is badly in need of a long preliminary chapter, setting forth the fact that for the great mass of the people the treatise is largely inapplicable. Mrs. Gilman, for her part, knows that the welfare of the little ones is bound up in the general concern. "Our children suffer individually from bad social conditions," she says, "but cannot be saved individually."

Man's relations in society are the outcome of what has gone before, the fruit of historical conditions. Only by bearing this in mind can we understand existing institutions, learn how codes of morality came to be formulated and determine what course of action makes for the common good. This method is that of historical materialism, the Socialist interpretation of history. That the method is a rational one is shown by the fact that the establishment of international commercial connections is followed by the holding of international con-

ferences on matters of a diplomatic, philosophical, scientific and sociological nature, although some of these gatherings are international in little else but name. It is shown in the fact that the so-called individualistic school of sociology, represented by Spencer, which was a reflex of capitalism in its younger days, is being replaced by the modern social school, indicating that our social fabric has become more complex.

It is in the domain of criminal sociology, of the special fields, that possibly the most satisfactory work has been done thus far. For this we are indebted particularly to Enrico Ferri, of the positive school of criminology of Lombroso.

Distinguishing three causes of crime—heredity, physical and social environments,—Ferri divides criminals into five groups: criminal madmen, born criminals, criminals by contracted habits, occasional criminals and criminals of passion, and declares that mad criminals and criminals of passion are 5 to 10 per cent of the total; born and habitual criminals 40 to 50 per cent, and occasional criminals, 40 to 50 per cent. While laying due stress upon this, Ferri goes on to say: "It is to the social factors that we must chiefly attribute the periodic variations of criminality." Again, "The truth is that the balance of crime is determined by the physical and social environment. But by changing the condition of the social environment, which is most easily

modified, the legislator may alter the influence of the telluric environment and the organic and psychic conditions of the population, control the greater portion of crimes and reduce them considerably." His studies lead him to formulate a "law of criminal saturation," which he explains as follows: "Just as in a given volume of water, at a given temperature, we find a solution of a fixed quantity of any chemical substance, not an atom more or less, so in a given social environment, in certain defined physical conditions of the individual, we find the commission of a fixed number of crimes." It is in obedience to this law that at one time men try to break out of jail, while at another time they try to break into it.

The positive school, therefore, considers the criminal a victim rather than a free will agent. It proceeds upon the theory that, as the saying goes, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and, in its program, offers "penal substitutes," whereby criminal propensities may be diverted into non-criminal and useful channels. It may be said, however, that the carrying out of this program is largely dependent upon the progress of the workers in the birth of a social consciousness. In the minor courts today, to the greatest degree, and to some extent in the superior courts, judges are chosen, not so much for being learned in the law as for their wealth, social station or service to the political machine. It goes without saying that this is equally true of legis-

lators and prison officials. Further, the "law of criminal saturation" is quite acceptable to one who regards society from the standpoint of historical materialism. The theory of saturation may be applied to other social ills; it is but another way of saying the human race tolerates one social order until it is ready for another.

In some respects the most courageous work done in sociology is that of the school of Ratzenhofer, represented by Professor Albion W. Small. Says the latter, in his work on "General Sociology:" "In the beginning were interests.... The primary interests of every man, as of every animal, is in sheer keeping alive.... The conspicuous element in the history of the race, so far as it has been recorded, is universal conflict of interests." The last sentiment is readily identified as the opening thought of the "Communist Manifesto," Engel's footnote included. Small lays stress upon class interests, dividing society into "three chief groups; the privileged; the middle class; those without property, rights, or influence."

This is a very good working foundation. Furthermore, if sociology is, as its exponents affirm, the science of sciences, a bouquet of the others, it must take a stand in this great conflict of contending interests. Sociology that exists for its own sake is sterile. There is no sociology for the sake of sociology, as Ferri well puts it. It must exist for the sake of so-

ciety. Just as there is a positive school of criminal sociology, so there must be a positive program for general sociology. Small perceives this. So he declares: "From the human standpoint no science is an end in itself. The proximate end of all science is organization into action." And again, "The sociologists believe that the most worthy work of men is effort to improve human conditions." Following this theme, Small talks in the language of the Socialist: "Civilization involves approach to a situation in which each person shall be a person, not a commodity for other persons; in which also each person shall be equally free with every other person to develop the type of personality latent in his natural endowment, not the sort of personality to which he would be limited by arbitrary division of opportunity."

Small accepts Socialist economics: "In the first place, capital itself produces nothing. It earns nothing. This is contrary to general economic presumption." And as a sequel: "If we are justified in drawing any general conclusions whatever from human experience thus far, it is safe to say that the social process tends to put an increasing proportion of individuals in possession of all the goods which have been discovered by the experience of humanity as a whole, and that all social programs should be thought out with a view to promotion of this tendency."

How near Small comes to the Socialist position may be gathered from this thought,

which is repeated throughout his work: "The great value of sociology to most people will be an indirect consequence of its furnishing a point of view, a perspective, an atmosphere, which will help to place all the problems of life with which each has to deal; or, to use a different figure, it will serve as a pass-key to all the theoretical difficulties about society that each of us may encounter." What is the nature of this pass key? "Indeed, we have come to realize that politics at bottom is very largely a maneuvering to control the means of controlling wealth." Here Small uses historical materialism as his pass-key.

But, likely because Small does not subscribe in full to the Socialist philosophy, his work has no positive program. And such a program it must have, to be worth anything. For, in his own words, "If our sociology turns out to be real knowledge, not the temporary aberration of a few pedants, it must have a message that can be translated from technical academic phraseology into the thought and words of common life." Small could not strike off better the charge of the Socialist; he could not better acknowledge the challenge of the workers that the fulfilling of this purpose is the express mission of the Socialist movement.

It is just the theory of historical materialism that is the vitalizing current in sociology. If "history is sociology in the yoke," as Small contends, and if sociology is largely a matter of interpretation, as he believes, he must ac-

cept historical materialism or offer a substitute. "History is just becoming rational, just beginning to ascertain its function and to comprehend its rightful domain. History—not that fragment we now call history, but the record and contemplation of the evolution of things—the history of social conditions and tendencies, of theories and experiments, of laws and institutions, in times gone by—that wider history which narrates events antedating human memory and consciousness—the history of the long processes in the evolution of life on the planet—history which tells of the mighty, unseen cataclysms which took place in the fiery cons of the earth's babyhood—the biography of planets and systems and of the peoples and institutions that have evolved upon them—this is history in its future, rational and universal sense." Such is the utterance of J. Howard Moore, in his "Better World Philosophy." Is it a mere accident that this new outlook toward history comes after Marx formulated the theory of historical materialism, showing that the rise of the labor movement would necessitate just such an attitude?

And is it an accident that the end of sociology is said to be the socialization of achievement, just at the time when the workers declare their program to be the socialization of industry? That it is no accident, we may gather from the fact that Ward accepts the Socialist position on this matter, as well as

embracing historical materialism, even though he calls himself a "sociocrat" instead of Socialist.

Let us put together what Ward tells us. "National freedom and political freedom have been achieved. Social freedom remains to be achieved." "The movement that is now agitating society is different from any of the previous movements, but it differs from them only as they differ from one another. It is nothing less than the coming to consciousness of the proletariat." "For the first time in the history of political parties there has been formed a distinctively industrial party, which possesses all the elements of permanence and may soon be a controlling factor in American politics. Though this may not as yet presage a great social revolution, still it is precisely the way in which a reform in the direction indicated should be expected to originate." "There is only one live problem, the maximum equalization of intelligence." "The union, association and complete fusion of all races into one great homogeneous race—the race of man—is the final step in social evolution." "Mankind wants no eleemosynary schemes, no private nor public benefactions, no fatherly oversight of the privileged classes, nor any other form of patronizing hypocrisy. They only want power—the power which is their right and which lies within their grasp. They have only to reach out and take it. The victims of privative ethics are in the immense

majority. They constitute society. They are the heirs of all the ages. They have only to rouse and enter upon their patrimony that the genius of all lands and of all time has generously bequeathed to them."

And Morgan, too, accepts the Socialist position in saying: "When the intelligence of mankind rises to the height of the great question of the abstract rights of property,—including the relations of property to the state, as well as the rights of persons to property,—a modification of the present order of things may be expected. The nature of the coming changes it may be impossible to conceive; but it seems probable that democracy, once universal in a rudimentary form and repressed in many civilized states, is destined to become again universal and supreme."

The sociology that responds to every test, therefore, is Socialist sociology. It furnishes the pass-key to understand the society of the past and to explain its present trend. It rests upon the theory that material interests are of fundamental importance and that they must be satisfactorily adjusted before there can be peace among mankind. It realizes that so long as one man anywhere is a thrall, the human race is enslaved. It points to the war of the classes and declares that the future of the working class is the future of society. It brings sociology down to earth and the common man. Its program is the life-giving force to sociology: to socialize achievement by con-

verting the means of production into collective property, thereby making the fullest and freest development of the individual accord with the welfare and progress of society, and replacing the existing chaos and conflict by harmony and happiness.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY

From the earliest times what man lacked in knowledge he made up in imagination. And the less he was informed as regards what occurred about him, the more extravagant were the speculations he indulged in. Consequently his intellectual growth consists, in some measure at least, in a process of disillusionment.

By degrees man has extended the realm of the known and limited that of the unknown. At first the universe appeared as chaos. Then it was seen that everything exists in motion through time and space. Then the distinction became clear between the organic and the inorganic, between the animate and the inanimate, between the lower animals and man. Then came the classification of phenomena: the study of the heavenly bodies, of the activity of matter, of its composition, of organic life, of consciousness, and of society. Having classified the data gathered, man formulates theories, learns the purpose of everything and offers his explanation of what we are, how we came to be and whither we are going.

Philosophizing about things is the highest function of the mind. For in a proper sense philosophy is something more than science; it

is like standing upon one's tiptoes above what we know to take a peep into what is just beyond and what some day we may understand. It should be stated at once, however, that there is more poetry than truth in the verse: "We are such stuff as dreams are made of." Sentiments of that kind belong to the earlier ages, when men were engaged in speculating as to the number of spirits that can dance on the point of a needle. Philosophy deals with the realities of life, no less so than does science. We spin our philosophies only as we human beings must, because of what we and the universe are. Science commences where metaphysics ends. Science does not lose itself in metaphysics. Metaphysics finds itself in science.

Ideas originate in our brains, not outside of us. What we call the mind of man, like everything else, began in simpler forms. Fitch and Jacques Loeb even trace it back to inanimate nature. The impulse out of which intellect has sprung is intuition, which is developed further in many animals than in man. Thus animals scent danger more quickly than man and are superior weather prophets. Because intuition appears to be more deeply seated in the female of the race, enabling her to peremptorily pass judgments that the male arrives at only after laborious thought, intuition is often spoken of as a feminine attribute.

Man thinks what he cannot help thinking. Professor William James, in his work on "Psychology," states his fundamental propo-

sition in this wise: "The first and foremost concrete fact which everyone will affirm to belong to his inner experience is the fact that consciousness of some sort goes on. 'States of mind' succeed each other in him. If we could say in English 'it thinks,' as we say 'it rains' or 'it blows,' we should be stating the fact most simply and with the minimum of assumption. As we cannot we must simply say that thought goes on." This observation every one verifies when he speaks of a thought coming to him "as quick as a flash."

Just as we cannot conceive of any other color except those we know or a combination of them, so we entertain only such ideas as are the result of the experience of what is in us. "Imagination cannot transcend experience." Lester F. Ward puts it. When philosophy tried to do so, he says "it floated in the air and fought the battle of the shades." "The history of successive meanings of words solves the first difficulty; it shows the concrete meaning always preceding the abstract meaning," remarks Lafargue. Among many instances of like nature, he calls our attention to the legends surrounding certain numbers, showing what a hard time the savage had in training himself to count beyond two. And Professor Seligman says: "Everywhere the physical, material substratum was recognized long before the ethical connotation was reached."

Ideas are of value only as they respond to material, historical fact. Detached from the conditions to which they rightfully belong, their

significance is warped. The problems confronting society are not hypothetical. Thus secession should hardly have shocked the North, since abolitionists and New Englanders had advocated such a policy long before the South carried it into execution.

Dualism—separation of ideas from things—appears in many shapes. It is one of the most striking features of some outworn philosophies. Thus Kautsky says of Kant: "Through him did philosophy first become the science of science, whose duty it is not to teach a distinct philosophy, but how to philosophize." Yet Kant believed there to be in everything "the thing in itself," as apart from the combination of its qualities. Instead of examining the merits and demerits of men and institutions, this process of reasoning would make us hold to "the divine right of kings," "the sacredness of contract" and the infallibility of courts.

The consequence of dualism is, as in Spencer's case, the contemplation of an unknowable, separate and distinct from the knowable, forever closed to the human mind. Regarding which it might well be observed: If there is, we do not know of it. Much is indeed unknown. But some of what was formerly unknown is no longer so. While we do not rush to the other extreme—ultimately everything will be known—we can say that considerable of it will some day be understood.

Again, in Hegel's case, there is dualism based upon the idea as the primary. Engels describes the Hegelian philosophy in these

words: "In this system—and herein is its great merit—for the first time the whole world, natural, historical, intellectual, is represented as a process, i. e., as in constant motion, change, transformation, development, and the attempt is made to trace out the internal connection that makes a continuous whole of all this movement and development.... From this point of view the history of mankind no longer appeared as a wild whirl of senseless deeds of violence all equally condemnable at the judgment seat of mature philosophic reason, and which are best forgotten as quickly as possible; but as the process of evolution of man himself." Hegel sought in the evolution of ideas for a philosophy of history, rather than in the development of institutions out of and into social orders. As a consequence Hegel lost himself in the pursuit of the absolute. His method is satisfactory; the content of that method, the system, is insufficient.

It is hardly accidental that Spencer and Hegel are found defending the existing order, disciples of so-called individualism. For a philosophy seeking the absolute is likely to be nothing more than a mirage of class dominion. The absolute in philosophy accompanies the absolute in economics, polities and social relations, accompanies the concentration of property, power and position into the hands of the monopolist.

Breaking away from the Hegelian school, and marking another step forward, stands Feuerbach. Feuerbach declared his position

to be: "Backwards I am in accord with the materialists, but not forwards." This attitude, Engels, in his work on "Feuerbach," has very well hit off. "The under half of him was materialist, the upper half idealist." Feuerbach is intermediary, the connecting link. The next school is that of Marx, the materialistic conception of history. Marx's method differs little from the Hegelian. But in the gathering of data, material conditions and social relations play a more important part than speculations. The Hegelian system is turned right side up.

Caution must be exercised in employing the Marxian method. Ideas are not ignored. They are included. They are accepted as part of the historical data. But they do not exist alone. And the actual conditions that brought them into being are generally first considered. Marx emphasizes this point when he says in criticism of Feuerbach: "The materialistic doctrine that men are the products of conditions and education, different men therefore the products of other conditions and changed education, forgets that circumstances may be altered by men and that the educator has himself to be educated. It necessarily happens, therefore, that society is divided into two parts, of which one is elevated above society. (Robert Owen, for example)."

In Socialist philosophy there is no pursuit of the absolute, other than lies in recognizing the universe as the only absolute. Says Dietzgen, in his "Philosophical Essays:" "The absolute and the relative are not separated

transcendentally, they are connected with each other so that the unlimited is made up of an infinite number of finite limitations and each limited phenomenon possesses the nature of the infinite." Entertaining any other absolute is but a way of acknowledging the capitalist order to be absolute and final. The Socialist, for his part, regards the ending of the career of our ruling class as the beginning of the career of the working class, as making way for grander intellectual achievement.

With the Socialist, therefore, everything is relative. Everything exists by contrast. All things considered, what is here is superior to what has been, but inferior to what will be. In the words of Emerson: "The reputations of the nineteenth century will one day be quoted to prove its barbarism."

Again, society is not a general mass of useful members, some of whom happen to be more intelligent, industrious and thrifty than others. Society is split up into two distinct classes, those who produce most and possess least, and those who produce least and possess most. This deep-rooted contradiction is at the bottom of many others. It accounts to a great extent for the double code of ethics, the contrast between precept and practice, between the real and the ideal—a contrast so glaring that Ibsen makes one of his characters say: "Don't use that foreign word: Ideals. We've got the excellent native word: lies."

Wages and profits, poverty and plenty, slavery and mastery, go together. Truth is

relative, not absolute. There are no absolute standards of right and wrong. Everything is right or wrong only in relation to everything else. Estimates are of importance only as they conform to historical needs. There is no valid comparison, for instance, between the condition of the workers today and that of the workers of decades ago. A comparison of moment is that which shows whether they own a larger or smaller share of the national wealth, and whether they are masters of their lives to a greater extent than formerly.

As between right and wrong, wrong is the outgrown. As between true and false, false is the surpassed. Truth and right are all there is to false and wrong, with something in addition. To do right one must comprehend up to and beyond wrong. Just as the higher animals have grown out of others lower in the scale, and civilization out of barbarism and savagery, so what is morally right has grown out of what has become wrong. Right is superior to wrong—by contrast.

Socialism is capitalism, and all that has gone before, with something in addition—collectivism in the means of material existence. Socialism has, from being utopian, become scientific, and is developing from theory to practice. Socialist theories are—by contrast—more satisfactory than others, but ready to be abandoned should a better explanation of social change be advanced. And they are not sufficient unto themselves. They are broadening in the light of fresher knowledge. “Nor

do the Socialists consider Marx infallible," comments Hillquit. "Marxism is a living, progressive theory of a live, growing and concrete social movement, not an ossified dogma nor a final revelation. And the disciples of Karl Marx have always shown a true appreciation of the spirit of their master by developing, extending and, when necessary in the light of newer developments, even modifying his teachings." Furthermore, just as there were other playwrights, precursors and contemporaries of Shakespeare, who helped create the Elizabethan drama, so were there other thinkers, precursors and contemporaries of Marx and Engels, who helped describe the scientific foundations of modern Socialism.

Historical materialism operates in the domain of sociology. Now, sociologists admit that social conditions are not the result of one specific, pre-arranged, carried-out plan, but exist as the sum total of conflicting currents. What is necessary, therefore, is a clear understanding of the operation of the law of cause and effect, so that, for the future, the consequence of every act may be anticipated.

The analysis of the process of reasoning is the special task of philosophy. Philosophy takes up the thread where historical materialism drops it. This is made clear by Dietzgen when he says: "The positive outcome of philosophy concerns itself with specifying the nature of the human mind. It shows that this special nature of mind does not occupy an exceptional position, but belongs with the

whole of nature in the same organization." Historical materialism is supplemented by materialistic monism. Monism is the Socialist's method of reasoning, his dialectic. "The dialectic is," so Engels says, "as a matter of fact, nothing but the science of the universal laws of motion, and evolution in nature, human society and thought." And again, "Nature is the proof of dialectics," just as history is the proof of historical materialism.

The dialectic may be resolved into thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Against the thesis that the idea is foremost comes the antithesis that the material is foremost, following from which the synthesis accepts the idea through the thing. Against the thesis of hero worship comes the antithesis of historical conditions, following from which is the synthesis that, to a great extent, the individual is the instrument through which the general feeling finds expression. The Socialist position is neither at one extreme nor the other, neither idealism nor the old materialism, just as leading a normal life is to be neither a profligate nor a miser.

Let us now consider the non-Socialist. Possibly he is given to ancestor worship, holding that the proper course lies in a "return to the faith of our fathers." He fails to see that, to be consistent in this, civilization would have to be deprived of the institutions it has acquired since their time. Our forefathers, who were used to the ray of the candle, might be blinded by an arc light.

Moreover, what of value there was in their faith persists in our day. For the good, no less than the evil, liveth after them. Indeed we go so far as to say, in view of our additional wisdom and broader mental horizon, however lofty were the principles and ideals actuating them, the principles and ideals of our generation are loftier and grander.

Or, again, the philosophy of the non-Socialist is based upon notions that have been abstracted from actual conditions—abstract principles of right, justice, equality and the like. It is a philosophy of ideas and dangles in the air. Its meaning is lost, buried in the grave of antiquities. It boasts of no body, no substance. It is a philosophy that looks upon society as a conflict, not of men and economic interests, but of ideas of justice.

An example of a philosophy of abstract principles is anarchism, in many respects the antithesis of Socialism. Plechanoff correctly calls the anarchist a utopian, defining the utopian as "one who, starting from an abstract principle, seeks for a perfect social organization." The anarchist forgets, it is not principles men profess which we must consider, but what they perform. Not creeds, but deeds. Jefferson, who is often quoted as having given expression to the sentiment: "That government is best which governs least," stretched the authority vested in him as president to acquire the Louisiana territory. A philosophy is known by its fruit. So Plechanoff quotes Proudhon, acclaimed the father of anarchism,

offering this moth-worn homily as a solution of the labor question: "Workers, hold out your hands to your employers; and you, employers, do not deliberately repulse the advances of those who were your wage-earners."

Proudhon proved himself a utopian when he devised a banking system for the exchange of labor products years after Robert Owen's. As in the case of the pursuit of the absolute, the philosophy of abstract principles paints a capitalist utopia. So Kautsky says: "Anarchism arose from the reaction of the petty bourgeoisie against capitalism, which threatens and oppresses it."

Anarchists join with votaries of capitalism in decrying the tendency to rely on "paternalism;" in their looking upon Socialist control as a despotic bureaucracy that would stifle "individual incentive" and "personal liberty," and in warning us that Socialism is the "coming slavery." Keeping pace with capitalistic thought, moreover, anarchists advise the workers to refrain from voting just when the ruling class is exerting itself to disfranchise them.

A philosophy laying stress upon the aristocracy of ideas is one way or another a philosophy of the aristocratic class in society. The philosophy of the common people is carried upon the broad, democratic back of the realities of life.

It is because necessity is the mother of invention—especially material necessity—that there are simultaneous inventions in mechani-

cal appliances and simultaneous spinning of like philosophies. So it happens that, while every philosopher imagines his system to be right, his truths to be "natural" or "eternal," and his social scheme to be perfect, they are, none the less, the outcome of conditions at a certain time and place, and serviceable, if at all, only in their proper relation. What was once the faith of the cottage has often become the creed of the castle. So Nietzsche says, in his "*Human, All Too Human*," which may be taken as a refutation of the extreme philosophy that goes by his name: "Yet everything uttered by the philosopher on the subject of man is, in the last resort, nothing more than a piece of testimony concerning man during a very limited period of time." In so far as they did not echo former philosophers, the "natural rights of man" of the French Revolution and the "unalienable rights" of the American Revolution are the rights of the rising French and American bourgeoisie, contingent upon the advent of modern industry.

It is the important fact of modern industry, too, the handling of enormous instruments of production, requiring the co-operative labor of millions of workers, which shows that the problem confronting us is social, not personal. For as one question after another assumes the proportions of a social quantity indicating that a social cause has brought it into being and that it must have a social solution, it goes without saying that its solution is not to be found in so-called individualism, but in grow-

ing solidarity; not in the independence of the ego, but in the interdependence of humanity.

At the same time the psychological element growing out of the fact of the class struggle, class consciousness, is also of great importance. It is not enough that economic conditions should be deplorable and that there should be pity for the distress of the poor. The point must be reached when the workers realize that their salvation is to be found only in their own action as a class.

But even in the field of psychology, materialism has come to be considered of prime importance. "At present psychology is on the materialistic tack," declares Professor James, "and ought in the interest of ultimate success to be allowed full headway even by those who are certain she will never ietch the port without putting down the helm once more." And then comes Professor Elmer Gates, who, in his work on "The Mind and Brain," declares his experiments show that training the mental faculties increases the number of brain cells of the localities brought into play, that cells are multiplied by agreeable sensations and diminished by disagreeable emotion, that mind is a purely physiological function and that mind building is just as reasonable an aim as body building. But, more than that, historical materialism explains why psychology busies itself with the crowd and mass movements, rather than with isolated persons, why it has developed from individualistic to social.

The Socialist philosophy, like all others, is

partisan, with this reservation: It is the viewpoint of the most numerous class, the class most necessary to the existence of society, and, as such, it comes nearest to being the viewpoint of society as a whole, out of which will grow the monistic philosophy of the future.

At the same time the Socialist subscribes to the sentiment expressed by Engels, shortly before his death, to Labriola: "We are as yet at the very beginning of things." For society is not of one piece. It is the sum total of many divergent interests and tendencies, together with numerous relics in institutions and thought from former ages. No philosophy can exhaust society. And for us, just as Marxian economic theories cover only capitalist production, just as the theory of the class struggle does not explain all conflict but only that due to the division of society into classes, just as historical materialism does not account for all social relations but rather offers a method for finding the connection between them, so does the Socialist philosophy as a whole not aim to interpret everything about us but only those more important activities that go far toward determining the general welfare.

The Socialist, to make use of a common expression, "takes things philosophically." He knows that the great reform waves that sweep over the country, and the confusion of issues in campaign times are not agencies of reaction so much as they are symptoms of public dissatisfaction. He knows that, beneath the smoke, the fires of social change are blazing

ever more brightly. He knows that theories, doctrines, philosophies and movements must pass through the crucible of experience. The Socialist takes things philosophically for his cause is reared upon the solid foundation of historical conditions.

While the Marxian theories are indispensable for a clear understanding of the structure and trend of society, they must be taken only as theories. It is only as they are continually examined in the light of experience that they do not ossify into cold formulæ but remain a live philosophy and a philosophy of life.

It is because these theories are in harmony with everyday affairs, that Socialism is already the North Star for tens of millions of people of all countries. The Socialist philosophy is in the safe keeping of the Socialist movement. It is as broad as the movement itself, as vast and as grand in its aspirations and ideals. That is why it has come to be the most precious stone in the sling of the modern David, Labor, with which to strike down the Goliath of class rule.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIALIST STATESMANSHIP

The fundamental aim of the Socialist movement is to make the principal means of wealth production, such as the lands, mines, mills and railroads, the collective property of the whole people. There necessarily follows democratic administration, the obligation of all able-bodied persons to perform useful service and the blending of freedom and labor so as to secure the maximum of individuality and social efficiency.

To effect the contemplated change of ownership from private to public, the workers, as a class, must control the government. It is the winning of complete political power, and the subsequent transfer of ownership, that constitutes the social revolution.

The revolution is the change, not the manner of the change. The social revolution may come peacefully, without anything approaching civil war. On the other hand, plenty of blood may be shed without there following any material improvement in the situation of the workers. So Hillquit, one of America's foremost Socialists, declares in his work on "Socialism in Theory and Practice:" "Violence is but an accident of the social revolution; it is by no means its necessary accompaniment, and

it has no place in the Socialist program." And Kautsky, acknowledged to be possibly the foremost exponent of modern Socialism, says in "The Social Revolution:" "Everyone is a revolutionary whose aim is that a hitherto oppressed class should conquer the power of the state." And, further on, "Even if a revolution were not a means to an end, but an ultimate end in itself which could not be bought at too dear a price, be it ever so much blood, one could not desire war as a means to let loose the revolution. For it is the most irrational means to this end." That explains why such Socialists as Hyndman and Bax, in England, speak of the question of violence as being incidental. The revolution is, therefore, an end, not the means to that end.

Socialists agree with Liebknecht in ridiculing the notion that "tomorrow it starts." For as Engels, in the introduction to the "Communist Manifesto," written as late as 1888, said in substantiation of Marx's position: "One thing especially was proved by the commune, viz., that 'the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.'" Hypothetically, the social revolution may come at one sweep. But in the discussion of tactics, the possibility of such a cataclysm must be held in abeyance.

Especially true is it for Socialism that history often does not repeat itself. For the coming reconstitution of society is unlike former ones. These were in the interest of minorities; they left society divided into

classes and altered only the form of the exploitation of labor. The coming change has in view the ending of exploitation and the abolition of class distinctions. It is for the benefit of the vast majority, even, broadly speaking, of society as a whole. The tactics of the Socialist movement are, perforce, essentially different from those of other movements.

At the same time, the Socialist movement is the reflex of actual conditions. At best its program is a more or less accurate analysis of the tendency of social progress. It takes the part of the workers in the struggle of the classes. It keeps pace with the awakened intelligence of the workers, securing for them what relief it can while holding fast to its ultimate ideal.

Nor is the Socialist movement the only agency working for a better social order. There are several others. The attitude of Socialists toward these other movements is very well presented by Kautsky: "I must not be misunderstood in the sense. . . . that I think co-operative societies, trades unions, the entry of the Socialist party into municipalities and parliaments, or the securing of individual reforms, to be worthless. Nothing could be further from my intention than that. On the contrary, that is all of great service to the proletariat; it only becomes of no importance as a means of staving off the revolution—in other words, the capture of political power by the proletariat."

Hillquit is one with Kautsky: "The Socialists do not foster the illusion," he says, "that voluntary co-operative societies of labor, either for production or for consumption, could gradually and by the strength of their own development, supersede the prevalent capitalist methods of production and distribution." And speaking of England, in which country co-operation has flourished for three-quarters of a century, Sidney Webb, in "Socialism in England," says: "Less than one four-hundredth part of the industry of the country is yet carried on by co-operation. The whole range of industrial development seems against it, and no ground for hope in co-operation as an answer to the social problem can be gained from economic history." In Belgium, where co-operative societies have attained the greatest measure of success, they were started before production on a large scale had become established.

Of trades unions, Kautsky says: "I regard the trades unions as an equally indispensable weapon in the proletarian class war as a Socialist party, and both are intimately dependent on one another." Hillquit estimates the membership of trades unions throughout the world to be 11,000,000, or a million more than the estimated Socialist vote. The efficacy of trades unionism depends, of course, upon conditions peculiar to each country. While in many countries trades unionism is a very powerful weapon, Bebel is of the opinion that it is, for the future, of little avail in America

because of the strength of concentrated capital. This by no means reflects against "mass" strikes for better conditions of labor or political rights. But mass strikes are not generally considered dependable means for accomplishing the social revolution.

The nature of the weapons used in the class war from time to time depends upon circumstances that are forever changing. That explains why Socialists do not underestimate the good work done by organized labor, co-operative associations, workers' insurance societies and farmers' alliances, in their own field of endeavor. But as the relation between the two classes, notwithstanding, continues to intensify, Socialists come to lay more and more stress upon the winning of political power.

In entering politics Socialists act independently of other parties. The Socialist party does not compromise. It declines to support candidates of other parties, or to accept endorsements from them. "For our party and for our party tactics," says Liebknecht, in "No Compromise," "there is but one valid basis: the basis of the class struggle, out of which the Socialist party has sprung up, and out of which alone it can draw the necessary strength to bid defiance to every storm and to all its enemies." Hillquit emphasizes this point. "Experience has abundantly demonstrated," he says, "that whenever a party of the propertied classes has invited the political co-operation of the working class, the latter has, with few exceptions, been used by it as a

cat's paw for the furtherance of its own class interests." And while, in practical work, concessions have to be made in going from principles to tactics, which Liebknecht was one of the first to see, he warns us that "questions of tactics very easily shift into questions of principle." So, again, Hillquit says: "The Socialist platform is the only political platform which is practically identical in its main features and important details in all civilized countries. . . . We observe that while the details of Socialist policy and tactics vary in every country, and are modified with every economic and political change, its most salient features are identical everywhere, and have undergone but little change since the days when the Socialist party first established itself in practical politics."

The Socialists of each country can face their problems only in their own way. So Herron says, in "*The Day of Judgment:*" "The mightiest voice lifted in the German Reichstag is that of Bebel; and there is nothing concerning the German people that Bebel does not have his say about. . . . The development of Italian Socialism has been through the distinctly Italian appeal made by Ferri and by those who work with him."

A few general points in Socialist tactics may be established at the outset. Convinced that the institutions of a period are largely the reflex of material conditions, and, in so far as they are to be altered, will be altered largely through the change of those conditions, the

Socialist party does not concern itself, for instance, with religious matters or the form of the family. Belief in a supreme being cannot be eliminated by decree, as the French Revolutionists imagined, nor re-established by proclamation, as the reaction thought. Socialists therefore do not permit their movement to be divided by sex, creed, race, nationality or other distinctions. In this respect, as in many others, the Socialist movement is inclusive rather than exclusive.

Again, as an innocent speculation sometimes indulged in, under Socialism the state will lose such coercive functions as spring from class rule, and its police powers, under the superior environment, may "die out" altogether. But while, for many, this is a "consummation devoutly to be wished," like all consummations it cannot be reached by wishing, or by arbitrarily demanding it. It is one of the secrets of the future, and concerns Socialists at present very little.

In our own country we are confronted by conditions peculiar to ourselves. This nation is an amalgam of troops of immigrants from all lands, with different traditions, creeds, and ideals, which have been more or less assimilated in what we term the American spirit. Apart from the important cleavage into classes, the various sections of the country have their own economic interests. The result of such a clash of divergent issues can only with difficulty be refined down to something in the shape of a broad national policy. This may

be noted in the fact that from the very first our government has sought to solve all questions by compromise, in which the aroma of the fleshpot was, in no little degree, the guiding motive, compromise that too often only procrastinated the day of settlement that jeopardized the very existence of the nation.

One thing, however, is quite positive. Considering the pains taken by the framers of the constitution to thwart the will of the people at every turn, permitting the bill of rights to slip in as amendments, in order to silence criticism, which Professor J. Allen Smith well shows in his work on "The Spirit of American Government," it is doubtful if a greater myth has ever been invented than that of American liberty. Of no country is it truer than of America, that the government is merely "a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie."

America is a country of two parties. Not that the distinction between parties has always been easy to define. In point of fact parties have not hesitated to change front in interpreting the constitution "strictly" or "loosely" as it suited them. But every minor party has either quickly become a major party or its demands have been absorbed, if not emasculated, by one of the larger parties. When this has not happened, the minor party soon sunk into insignificance.

Regarding the questions which presumably separate Republicans and Democrats, James

Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," written in 1896, says, after enumerating several national matters: "Neither party has anything definite to say upon these issues; neither party has any principles, any distinctive tenets. . . . All has been lost except office or the hope of it." In municipal elections, as is well known, the deliberate attempt is being made to wipe out party lines. It is recognized that the two old parties are the obverse and reverse sides of the same shield. "Each equally leans upon the respectable and wealthy classes," continues Bryce, "the Republicans more particularly on these classes in the North, the Democrats on the same classes in the South." Since 1872 both parties have, in their platforms, mentioned the struggle between capital and labor to be an issue. But they did little more than mention it. Still, if the Republican party, which has been in control practically ever since the civil war, has demonstrated its incapacity to cope with the labor question, there is no hope that the Democratic party will ever be given the opportunity to try its hand, for there are many signs of a coming disintegration of the Democracy. The Republican party, moreover, undoubtedly has the confidence of the larger capitalists, so that there is every reason for believing that the future contest will be between Republicans and Socialists.

This brings us to the problem of the Socialist party's platform. In that platform, the amount of importance placed in the working program of industrial, political and social

measures comprising its more immediate demands, depends entirely upon general circumstances. If it is true, for example, that the trades unions in America are no longer able to cope with organized capital, it will, of necessity, result in the Socialist party's incorporating their demands in its program. This, indeed, is already happening. And trades unions, for their part, are coming more and more to make the securing of political power part of their aim. For Socialists do not accept the theory that the misery of the workers should be permitted to increase. Moreover, what melioration the Socialist party is able to work does not bear the taint of pauperism. It is received as part payment of labor's rightful heritage. Nor is that melioration desired simply as palliative. It is accepted as being in line with the progress of the working class.

Immediate measures are not sufficient unto themselves. Thus even Jaures, who represents the more moderate wing of the Socialist party, says in his "Studies in Socialism:" "So long as a class does not own and govern the whole social machine, it can seize a few factories and yards if it wants to, but it really possesses nothing. To hold in one's hands a few pebbles of a deserted road is not to be the master of transportation." For this reason the working program must be considered as an organic whole, which, while it serves the more proximate needs of the wealth producers, is nevertheless

less animated by the ideal of complete emancipation from the dominion of capital.

Since Socialism is not a ready-made system, but an organic growth, in parliamentary activity Socialists must work with the material at hand, even to completing the work begun, or imperfectly done, by their predecessors of another political faith. In fact, Socialists can support many measures advanced by their opponents. Thus Marx designated as a revolution the ten-hour factory law secured in England through the conflict between capitalists and landlords, because it involved the new principle of state aid for the workers. And so Bebel supported Bismarck's working people's insurance law, although it was one of the measures with which Bismarck hoped to stamp out the growing Socialist sentiment.

Because victories come first in municipalities, it is here principally that Socialists have, thus far, been able to shape legislation and administration to their liking. Furthermore, because it has its finger upon the seat of government, and can, guided by a real social conscience, keep that "eternal vigilance" which Wendell Phillips held to be "the price of liberty," the municipality is apt to be entrusted with the greatest measure of power by Socialists. So Hillquit says: "While the state as such will probably retain certain general functions, it will no doubt be found more convenient to vest the more vital and direct functions in political organizations embracing smaller territories. The Socialists regard the

present city or township as the nucleus of such a political unit."

In such municipalities as the Socialists control, school children are fed and clothed, municipal enterprises extended, ampler provision made for public institutions, legal advice furnished gratuitously, and steps taken to improve the condition of the workers in many other directions. In his pamphlet entitled "What Socialists would do if they Won in this City," A. M. Simons shows how the experience of Socialists in foreign countries could be utilized in America.

Municipal ownership is not considered of nearly so much importance as the measures just cited. Not that municipal control might not be of considerable service under favorable circumstances. Among the suggestions for such ownership the Socialist party advisory program of 1904 mentions the following: All industries dependent on franchises, street cars, electric and gas lighting, telephones, ice houses, coal and wood yards. It may be remarked, in passing, that in this country in 1899 already more than half of the waterworks were owned and operated by the municipalities, and about one-seventh of the electric light plants. What hampers the efforts of Socialists in municipalities is the fact that, to use Professor Smith's words: "Local self-government is recognized neither in theory nor in practice under our political scheme." The rights of our cities are stipulated in their charters, granted by the state legislatures. What we call

municipal government exists only by sufferance and is restricted in every direction. The autonomy of the city, as regards all matters in which it alone is concerned, is one of the first demands of Socialist legislators.

Municipal activity is only a beginning toward Socialism. In his analysis of this question Kautsky says: "Municipal Socialism finds its limitations in the existing order of state and society, even where universal suffrage prevails in the communes. The commune is always tied down to the general economic and political conditions, and cannot extricate itself from them singly."

In this connection it may also be observed that, while every political victory is of some benefit to the workers, it may happen when they secure control of one department of the government, such as the legislative, the functions of some other department, either judicial or executive, will be extended so as to destroy the workers' power. So Hillquit says: "The work of systematically rebuilding the economic and political structure of modern society on the lines of Socialism, can begin only when the Socialists have the control of the entire political machinery of the state, i. e., of all the legislative, executive and judicial organs of the government." Each victory is, consequently, but an incident making for the social revolution.

In state and national parliamentary bodies more important steps can be taken. It is here that work is provided for the unemployed,

whose number constantly increases with the perfection of machinery, the elimination of the waste of competition and the commercialization of backward countries. Here, too, the fight is made for universal suffrage, the extension of political liberty and the strengthening of the economic and social position of the workers. Larger problems are considered.

Whether government ownership is of benefit to the mass of the people depends upon the influence they exercise over the government. It is not of itself necessarily a step in advance. The best that can be said for it theoretically is contained in this utterance of Engels: "State ownership of the productive forces is not the solution of the conflict (between workers and capitalists), but concealed within it are the technical conditions that form the elements of that solution." Covering its practical operations, at the annual convention of the German Socialist party in 1892, the following resolution was passed: "State Socialism so-called inasmuch as it aims at state ownership for fiscal purposes, seeks to substitute the state for the private capitalist, and to confer on it the power to subject the people to the double yoke of economic exploitation and political slavery."

In the broader field of national activity, the Socialist party has to deal with the relation of the various elements among the wealth producers. The proper attitude to be maintained toward agricultural holdings is one of the most intricate and difficult of questions. Simons,

in his "American Farmer," the only serious attempt made by an American Socialist to handle the agrarian problem, says: "One trade after another has left the farm and farming itself has been transformed until the farmer has become a specialist working within one little narrow field and as absolutely dependent upon outside social forces as the artisan at his bench." Simons deems the average farmer little more than an employing agent and resident supervisor for the exploiting class, whose wage does not rise far above the subsistence level. Because he declares the small farmer to be the "essential economic factor in agriculture in exactly the same way that the wage-worker is the essential economic factor in general capitalistic production," Simons accepts Kautsky's definition: "The proletarian of the country is the farmer."

In discussing this question, Kautsky says that, "where small agricultural holdings prevail, there the organs of social or Socialist production in agriculture have first to be created, and that can only be the result of a slow development." Continuing, he says: "No Socialist of any weight or standing has ever as yet demanded that the peasants should be expropriated or their lands confiscated." Yet Kautsky looks forward to the time when "the peasants will amalgamate their holdings and work them in common."

In answer to the argument that under communal ownership the farmer will not have the interest in the land he has when it is his own

property, Ferri says: "We see, for example, that, even in our present individualist world, those survivals of collective property in land—to which Laveleye has so strikingly called the attention of sociologists—continue to be cultivated and yield a return which is not lower than that yielded by lands held in private ownership, although these communist or collectivist farmers have only the right of use and enjoyment, and not the absolute title."

Small trade, sometimes regarded as of moment to the middle class, Vandervelde declares to be "the special refuge of the cripples of capitalism," who often have "only a phantom of independence, and are really in the hands of a few great money lenders, manufacturers or merchants." Where this is not true, it is doubtful if they would be disturbed to any extent. For Socialism is not of one piece and pattern, but, rather, the outgrowth of the multiform relations prevailing under capitalism. So Kautsky tells us: "The most varied kinds of property in the means of production, state, municipal, co-operative (distributive), co-operative (productive), private—could exist side by side in a Socialist society. . . . The same variety of the economic machinery as exists to-day would be quite possible in a Socialist society. Only the hurry and the bustle, the fighting and the struggling, the extermination and the ruin of the present day struggle for life will be eliminated, just as the antagonism between the exploiter and the exploited will disappear."

Socialists, as is well known, are opposed to militarism. Says Kampffmeyer, in his little work on German Socialist tactics: "Since the first days of its vigorously joyful existence, until its fully endowed maturity, there sounds through all its party declarations the rough and revolutionary word: 'For this military system, not a man and not a penny!'"

There is reason enough for this stand merely on the score of the millions wasted in metal, powder and rations, let alone the toll of life and suffering paid by the workers. To form some idea of what this price is, Karl Liebknecht estimates the present military expenditures of Europe as reaching \$3,250,000,000 annually.

The growing sentiment of international solidarity is, by all odds, the most important step in the direction of universal peace. Socialists are justly proud of having, within recent years, done much toward preventing wars between Austria and Italy, France and Germany, and Norway and Sweden. Amity among nations, cementing the ties of fraternity to the end of making the earth the common possession of all, is the goal of the international Socialist movement. The vari-colored flags of different countries serve only to lift one man's arm against his brother; the crimson standard of Socialism is breaking down the barriers that stand in the way of universal peace and good will.

"The growth of the democratic spirit is one of the most important facts in the political

life of the nineteenth century," Professor Smith observes. "From present indications, we are at the threshold of a new social order under which the few will no longer rule the many." And Spargo, in his "Socialism," has splendidly developed this thought of the "Communist Manifesto:" "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

The task it is the historic mission of the Socialist movement of the world to achieve is as magnificent in its proportions as it is in its ideals. The tremendous nature of that task cannot be overestimated. Kautsky well reminds us, in one of the concluding passages of his great work on the social revolution: "The proletariat will require high intelligence, strong discipline, perfect organization of its great masses; and these must, at the same time, have become most indispensable in economic life if it is to attain the strength sufficient to overcome so formidable an opponent. We may expect that it will only succeed in the latter when it will have developed these qualities in the highest degree, and that, therefore, the domination of the proletariat, and with it the social revolution, will not take place until not only the economic, but also the psychological conditions of a Socialist society are sufficiently ripened."

The Socialist looks forward to the future with the enthusiasm of certain victory. For

the stream of the new world thought and movement is flowing on. Little more than half a century ago its headwaters gathered in the work of Marx and Engels, gathered from the rockribbed mountains of philosophy, economics, politics and history. Here a brook empties its crystal clear waters of learning into it; there a sister current greets it. Further along is its confluence with science; art and literature light its way. The stream rushes on. It is now international in character. It ever broadens, reaches into new lands, gains in prestige. It commands the voice of governments; it swerves the destiny of nations. As its powers grows, kingdoms tremble, thrones totter, tyrannies fall. The social revolution is fought and won. The old epoch—the epoch of class strife and subjection of the toilers—is ended. The new era—the era of the comradeship and freedom of labor—is begun.

APPENDIX.

The following course of reading is suggested to the student. It covers the subjects touched upon in the foregoing pages, and is arranged in the order the works should be read.

For any one who cannot see his way clear to do such extensive reading, a short cut may be made by taking the works under the captions "Introduction" and "Socialist Statesmanship," after which that phase of the question particularly appealing to the reader may be studied.

INTRODUCTION

What's So and What Isn't. By John M. Work.
The Socialists. By John Spargo.

The Common Sense of Socialism. By John Spargo.
The Socialist Program. By Karl Kautsky.

Modern Socialism. By Charles H. Vail.

Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Charles H. Vail.

Communist Manifesto. By Karl Marx and F. Engels.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By F. Engels.

Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome. By William Morris and Belfort Bax.

History of Socialism in the United States. By M. Hillquit. Funk and Wagnalls Co., New York.

Recent Progress of the Socialist Movement in America. By M. Hillquit.

THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT

Capital, Vol. I, part 8. By Karl Marx.

Condition of the Working Class in England. By F. Engels. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London.

- People of the Abyss. By Jack London. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- History of Great American Fortunes. By Gustavus Myers.
- American Pauperism. By I. Ladoff.
- Poverty. By Robert Hunter. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Packingtown. By A. M. Simon.
- Bitter Cry of the Children. By John Spargo. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor. May, 1904. Washington, D. C.

SOCIALIST ECONOMICS

- What is Capital? By F. Lassalle.
- Wage-Labor and Capital. By Karl Marx.
- Value, Price and Profit. By Karl Marx.
- Collectivism. By Emile Vandervelde.
- Evolution of Modern Capitalism. By John A. Hobson. Scribners, New York.
- Commercial Crises of the 19th Century. By H. M. Hyndman. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London.
- Economies of Socialism. By H. M. Hyndman. Twentieth Century Press, London.
- Marxian Economics. By Ernest Untermann.
- Poverty of Philosophy. By Karl Marx.
- Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. By Karl Marx. International Library Publishing Co., New York.
- Capital. By Karl Marx.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

- War of the Classes. By Jack London. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- Mass and Class. By W. J. Ghent. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- The World's Revolutions. By Ernest Untermann.
- Story of the French Revolution. By E. Belfort Bax. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London.

- History of the Paris Commune. By E. Belfort Bax. Twentieth Century Press, London.
- From Revolution to Revolution. By George D. Herron.
- Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons.
- Rise of the American Proletarian. By Austin Lewis.
- The Pullman Strike. By W. H. Carwardine.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Socialism, Positive and Negative. By Robert Rives LaMonte.

Evolution of Property. By Paul Lafargue.

Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History. By A. Labriola.

Socialism and Philosophy. By A. Labriola.

Economic Interpretation of History. By E. R. A. Seligman. University of Columbia Press, New York.

Economic Foundations of Society. By A. Loria.

Ethics and the Materialistic Conception. By Karl Kautsky.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx. By Louis Boudin.

Revolution and Counter Revolution. By Karl Marx.

Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. By Karl Marx.

Eastern Question. By Karl Marx.

SOCIALISM AND SCIENCE

The Triumph of Life. By Wilhelm Boelsche.

The End of the World. By Wilhelm Meyer.

The Making of the World. By Wilhelm Meyer.

Life and Death. By E. Teichmann.

The Evolution of Man. By Wilhelm Boelsche.

Germs of Mind in Plants. By R. H. Francé.

The Universal Kinship. By J. Howard Moore.

Evolution, Social and Organic. By A. M. Lewis.

Parasitism, Organic and Social. By Jean Massart

and Emile Vandervelde. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London.

Socialism and Modern Science. By E. Ferri.

Science and Revolution. By Ernest Untermann.

SOCIALIST SOCIOLOGY

Ancient Society. By Lewis Morgan.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By F. Engels.

Woman under Socialism. By August Bebel. New York Labor News Co., New York.

Man and Woman. By Havelock Ellis. Scribners, New York.

Criminal Sociology. By E. Ferri. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

Positive School of Criminology. By E. Ferri.

Better World Philosophy. By J. Howard Moore.

General Sociology. By Albion W. Small. U. of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Psychic Factors of Civilization. By Lester F. Ward. Ginn & Co., Boston.

Applied Sociology. By Lester F. Ward. Ginn & Co., Boston.

SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY

Physical Basis of Mind and Morals. By M. H. Fitch.

Feuerbach. By F. Engels.

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism. By F. Engels.

Anarchism and Socialism. By George Plechanoff.

Mr. Mallock's Ability. By M. Hillquit. Socialist Literature Co., New York.

Ten Blind Leaders of the Blind. By Arthur M. Lewis.

Human, All Too Human. By F. Nietzsche.

Social and Philosophical Studies. By Paul Lafargue.

Philosophical Essays. By Joseph Dietzgen.

Positive Outcome of Philosophy. By Joseph Dietzgen.

SOCIALIST STATESMANSHIP

- The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky.
- Socialism in Theory and Practice. By M. Hillquit. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- No Compromise. By Wilhelm Liebknecht.
- Changes in the Theory and Tactics of the German Social-Democracy. By Paul Kampffmeyer.
- The Day of Judgment. By George D. Herron.
- American Farmer. By A. M. Simons.
- What the Socialists would do if they Won in this City. By A. M. Simons.
- Socialism. By John Spargo. The Macmillan Co., New York.
- The Road to Power. By Karl Kautsky. Daily Socialist, Chicago.

Unless otherwise indicated, works mentioned above are published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. A descriptive catalogue will be mailed to any one requesting it.

Socialist Speakers Wanted

The Socialist Party has over thousands of speakers within its ranks, and only a few hundred are seen daily. Preparation for this work, ignorant speakers do far more harm than good. We must have speakers with a clear understanding of what Socialists stand and how they propose to get it.

Nothing is more difficult than to find Socialist speakers, but you can save time and money by starting with the right organization and getting the speakers you want. We know where the standard and best books are, so inform them you start with them, and they will send you the names.

Reform School, Franklin	\$0.05
Industrial Standard, Indianapolis	.05
Industrial Standard, Birmingham	.10
Socialist Standard, LaMoure	.05
Reform Standard, Toledo	.05
Show Standard, Memphis, Tenn.	.10
Value Pits and Front Pages	.10
Wage Labor, St. Paul, Minn.	.05
Socialism, The People's Standard, Indianapolis	.10
Communist Monthly, Marx and Engels	.10
The Communist, Kansas City	.25
The Art of Leadership, Lewis	.50
International Socialist Review, New York	<u>1.00</u>
Total	\$2.50

Remember, ask for our Catalogue, and we will send you two copies of it free of postage. By the time you have read the Catalogue you will know more than most of the people who are making Socialist speeches at present, and you will be able to select additional books to study. Please may fill out the card below, and the address and begin to study.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO.
118 W. Kinzie St., Chicago.

Enclosed find \$1.00 for which please send at once your Soap-Boxer Combination of socialist literature.

Name

Address

P.O. State

Don't Talk Socialism

without first studying. It is too big a subject to learn from one booklet. But it costs only a little in time and money to get a clear understanding of the subject.

INDUSTRIAL SOCIALISM, by William D. Haywood and Frank Bohn, is the best general explanation of Socialism for beginners. Price 10 cents.

SHOP TALKS ON ECONOMICS, by Mary E. Marey, shows how the unpaid labor of the wage-worker makes profits for the capitalist, and why no reforms can benefit the working class. Price 10 cents.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE, by Karl Kautsky, one of the greatest Socialist books ever written, explains the whole structure of capitalist society and of the Socialist Republic of the future. Cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.

The Appeal to Reason, Girard, Kansas, 50 cents a year, is the greatest Socialist weekly in the world, with a circulation of more than half a million.

The International Socialist Review is the only great illustrated magazine advocating Socialism. \$1.00 a year, 10 cents a copy. This and the books named above are published by

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
118 W. Kinzie Street :: Chicago

Books by Karl Marx

Marx is the greatest of Socialist writers; study him for yourself if you want to understand the principles of Socialism and qualify yourself to explain them to others. His most important books may now be had in English at the following prices, postage included:

Capital, Volume I. The Process of Capitalist Production. Cloth, \$2.00.

Capital, Volume II. The Process of Circulation of Capital. Cloth, \$2.00.

Capital, Volume III. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole. Cloth, \$2.00.

A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Cloth, \$1.00.

The Poverty of Philosophy, a reply to Proudhon. Cloth, \$1.00.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, or Germany in 1848. Cloth, 50c.

Value, Price and Profit. Cloth, 50c.; paper, 10c.

The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels. Cloth, 50c.; paper, 10c.

The Civil War in France, with an Introduction by Frederick Engels. Paper, 25 cents.

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. Paper, 25c.

Wage-Labor and Capital. Paper, 5c.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

118 West Kinzie Street, Chicago

This book is DUE on the last
date stamped below

AUG 10 1962

JAN 11 1962

RECEIVED MLD

JAN 4 1962

3m-849(B5572)470

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UCLA-Young Research Library

HX86 .C66s

yr



L 009 508 944 7

HX86
C66s

